

5/26/2026 8:52:00 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By N. Arellano ,Deputy Clerk

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@zakaylaw.com
Nicole Noursamadi (State Bar #357246)
nicole@zakaylaw.com
Eden Zakay (State Bar #339536)
eden@zakaylaw.com
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com
3110 Camino Del Rio S., Suite 308
San Diego, CA 92108
Telephone: (619) 255-9047

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

FELIPE RANGEL, on behalf of the State of
California in Plaintiff's representative capacity
as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

v.

LABOR FORCE GROUP LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company; QWICK, INC., a
Delaware corporation; GIGPRO INC, a
Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 26CU029294N

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

1) VIOLATIONS OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR
CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.]

1 PLAINTIFF FELIPE RANGEL (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, in PLAINTIFF’S
2 representative capacity and on behalf of PLAINTIFF, the people of the State of California, and as
3 an “aggrieved employee” acting as a private attorney general under the Labor Code Private Attorney
4 General Act of 2004, Section 2699, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) only, alleges on information and belief, except
5 for PLAINTIFF’s own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against Defendants LABOR FORCE GROUP LLC,
8 a Delaware limited liability company; QWICK, INC., a Delaware corporation; and GIGPRO INC,
9 a Delaware corporation; (“DEFENDANTS”) seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on
10 behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees who worked for DEFENDANTS.
11 PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California**
12 **Labor Code Section 2699.** To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage
13 violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those
14 violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699.

15 2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFF to bring an action on
16 behalf of PLAINTIFF and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and
17 sole nature of this action.

18 3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for DEFENDANTS’
19 violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA that is, penalties and any
20 other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to PAGA. Nothing in this complaint should be
21 construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in a PAGA-only action.

22 4. PLAINTIFF brings this representative action pursuant to PAGA on behalf of the
23 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and other current and former aggrieved
24 employees of DEFENDANTS for engaging in a pattern and practice of wage and hour violations
25 under the California Labor Code.

26 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANTS
27 decreased their employment-related costs by systematically violating California wage and hour
28 laws.

6. DEFENDANTS' systematic pattern of wage and hour and Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order violations toward PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees in California include, *inter alia*:

- a. Failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods;
- b. Failure to allow employees to take duty-free meal and rest periods;
- c. Failure to pay all minimum, sick pay, regular and overtime wages;
- d. Failure to correctly calculate the regular rate of pay;
- e. Failure to pay within seven (7) days of the close of payroll;
- f. Failure to pay for all hours worked;
- g. Failure to maintain true and accurate records;
- h. Failure to reimburse for required business expenses;
- i. Failure to permit inspection of employee records;
- j. Failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- k. Failure to timely pay wages due during, and upon termination of employment.

7. PLAINTIFF reserves the right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

THE PARTIES

8. Defendant LABOR FORCE GROUP LLC (“Defendant Labor Force Group”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

9. Defendant QWICK, INC. (“Defendant Qwick”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

10. Defendant GIGPRO INC (“Defendant GigPro”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California

11. Defendant Labor Force Group, Defendant Qwick, and Defendant GigPro were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as evidenced by the

documents issued to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, by the company PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES performed work for each respectively, and as these entities each exerted control over the hours, wages and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Therefore, Defendant Labor Force Group, Defendant Qwick, and Defendant GigPro are jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS.”

12. DEFENDANTS own and operate a business that staffs employees to work at various employers in the hospitality industry in California, including in the County of San Diego.

13. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from September of 2024 to November of 2025, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

14. PLAINTIFF, and such persons who may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the PAGA, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to PLAINTIFF and all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendant Labor Force Group and/or Defendant Qwick and/or Defendant GigPro in California and classified as non-exempt employees (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of March 20, 2025, and the present (“PAGA PERIOD”).

15. PLAINTIFF is an “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE” within the meaning of Labor Code Section 2699(c) because PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS and personally suffered each of the alleged Labor Code violations committed by DEFENDANTS.

16. PLAINTIFF and all other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are, and at all relevant times were, employees of DEFENDANTS, within the meanings set forth in the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

17. Each of the fictitiously named defendants participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint. The true names and capacities of the Defendants named as DOES 1 THROUGH 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF. PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint, setting forth the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named Defendants when their true names

1 are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the
2 fictitious Defendants have participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint.

3 18. DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 THROUGH 50 (hereinafter collectively
4 “DEFENDANTS”), were PLAINTIFF’S employers or persons acting on behalf of PLAINTIFF’S
5 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code Section 558, who violated or caused to be
6 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
7 hours and days of work in any order of the IWC and, as such, are subject to civil penalties for each
8 underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code Section 558, at all relevant times.

9 19. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF’S employer or persons acting on behalf of
10 PLAINTIFF’S employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person,
11 within the meaning of California Labor Code Section 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to any
12 employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are subject to
13 civil penalties for each underpaid employee.

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 20. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
16 Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business and Professions Code, Section 17203. This
17 Court has jurisdiction over AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ claims for civil penalties under the
18 Private Attorney General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Section 2698, *et seq.*

19 21. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
20 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times
21 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County,
22 and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against AGGRIEVED
23 EMPLOYEES.

24 **THE CONDUCT**

25 22. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
26 requirements of the IWC Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company policy, practice,
27 and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant
28 meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
2 EMPLOYEES for all time worked, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
3 EMPLOYEES for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
4 overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES meal and rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and
6 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses, and knowingly and intentionally failed
7 to issue to PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements
8 showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the
9 corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and
10 practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as
11 required by California law which allows DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair
12 advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to
13 toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD
14 should be adjusted accordingly.

15 **A. Meal Period Violations**

16 23. Pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS were required to pay
17 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked, meaning the time during
18 which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is
19 suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS
20 required PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the
21 time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically, DEFENDANTS required
22 PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFF'S off-duty
23 meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not even receive a partial lunch.
24 As a result, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited minimum wage and
25 overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and
26 without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANTS'
27 uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all
28 time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

1 24. During the PAGA PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work schedules and
2 DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
3 EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-duty meal breaks and
4 were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES were from time to time required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for
6 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, from time to
7 time DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a
8 second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which DEFENDANTS require these employees
9 to work ten (10) hour. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period
11 exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. DEFENDANTS'
13 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with legally required meal
14 breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records. PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
15 EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance
16 with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

17 **B. Rest Period Violations**

18 25. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
19 were from time to time also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten
20 (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and DEFENDANTS'
21 inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were from time to time denied
22 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
23 (4) hours, denied from time to time a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for
24 some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and denied from time to time a first,
25 second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or
26 more. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. PLAINTIFF and
28 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As

1 a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF
2 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by
3 DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

4 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

5 26. DEFENDANTS as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,
6 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF and
7 the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF
8 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf
9 of DEFENDANTS. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to
10 indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment.
11 California Labor Code Section 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her
12 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
13 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer,
14 even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to
15 be unlawful."

16 27. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to incur personal expenses as a result of and in furtherance of their
18 job duties for the use of their personal cell phones. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other
19 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to use their own cell phones in order to perform work
20 related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other
21 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell
22 phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF and other
23 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not
24 limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones, all on behalf of and for the benefit
25 of DEFENDANTS.

26 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

27 28. California Labor Code Section 226 requires an employer to furnish its employees an
28 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours

1 worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions,
2 (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
3 name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an
4 employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of
5 the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
6 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

7 29. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
8 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed
9 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed
10 to provide PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage
11 statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked and all
12 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding amount of time
13 worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest
14 periods.

15 30. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other
16 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements that provided all applicable hourly rates in
17 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in
18 violation of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(9).

19 31. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
20 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements that comply with
21 California Labor Code Section 226(a)(1)-(9).

22 32. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
23 with wage statements that violate California Labor Code Section 226. Further, DEFENDANTS'
24 violations are knowing and intentional; they were not isolated due to an unintentional payroll error
25 due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

26 **E. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

27 33. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time to time DEFENDANTS failed and continue
28 to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked.

1 34. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time to time DEFENDANTS required
2 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including
3 but not limited to, sending and receiving work-related communications. This resulted in
4 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES having to work while off-the-clock.

5 35. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
6 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

7 36. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, protocols, applications,
8 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

9 37. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and
10 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to document, track,
11 or pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages earned and owed for all the work
12 they performed.

13 38. PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were non-exempt employees,
14 subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

15 39. DEFENDANTS' policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
16 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed for
17 the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES typically
18 worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8) hours per day,
19 DEFENDANTS' policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

20 40. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
21 EMPLOYEES' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

22 41. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to
23 them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control, and benefit for the time spent
24 working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF
25 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is
26 evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

27
28 ///

1 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and**
2 **Redeemed Sick Pay**

3 42. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and continues
4 to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for
5 their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick
6 pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to
7 them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates,
8 meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and
9 practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct rate for all
10 overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay in
11 accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS’ business records.

12 43. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
13 their “regular rate of pay.” (Cal. Lab. Code § 510.) PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
14 EMPLOYEES were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific
15 elements of an employee’s performance.

16 44. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’
17 compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF
18 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ incentive wages based on their performance for
19 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
20 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
21 DEFENDANTS.

22 45. From time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay periods
23 where PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked overtime, double time, paid
24 meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-discretionary
25 bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as
26 part of the employees’ “regular rate of pay” and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all
27 non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program
28 to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the

1 incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be
2 included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment
3 of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay
4 to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANTS. Specifically,
5 California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-exempt employees shall
6 be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-
7 exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that
8 workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive
9 compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of sick pay compensation was in
10 violation of California Labor Code Section 246 the underpayment of which is recoverable under
11 California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

12 46. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
13 requirements of the IWC Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company policy, practice,
14 and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
15 EMPLOYEES at the correct rate of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest
16 period premiums, and sick pay. This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANTS is intended to
17 purposefully avoid the payment of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and
18 rest period premiums, and sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANTS
19 to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To
20 the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against
21 DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

22 **G. Sick Pay Violations**

23 47. California Labor Code Section 246(a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or
24 after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year
25 from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”
26 Further, California Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements.
27 From time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided
28 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with sick days and/or paid sick leave. As of January

1 1, 2024, DEFENDANTS failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and allow
2 employees to use at least forty hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

3 48. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees
4 with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to
5 time, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF
6 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave
7 available.

8 **H. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

9 49. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. PLAINTIFF
11 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, did not receive payment of all wages,
12 including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and
13 rest period premium wages within the permissible time period.

14 50. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 201, "If an employer discharges an
15 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately."
16 Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his
17 or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee
18 has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is
19 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting." PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
20 EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the
21 time of their discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of California Labor Code Sections
22 201 and 202. Further, DEFENDANTS' violations are willful and intentional; they were not isolated
23 due to an unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

24 51. As such, PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely
25 paying all wages due at time of termination for all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose
26 employment ended during the PAGA PERIOD.

27
28 ///

1 **I. Unlawful Deductions**

2 52. DEFENDANTS, from time to time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
3 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' pay without explanations and without authorization to do so or
4 notice to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. As a result, DEFENDANTS violated
5 Labor Code Section 221.

6 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

7 53. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in place an immutable
8 timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
9 EMPLOYEES for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours.
10 Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted
11 in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES being undercompensated for all of their time
12 worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round
13 the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
14 EMPLOYEES in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the
15 applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
16 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by
17 working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable
18 overtime rates.

19 54. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
20 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' time being
21 inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding policy
22 and practice caused PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work as ordered by
23 DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal
24 break.

25 **K. Timekeeping Manipulation**

26 55. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, did not have an
27 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES for the actual time PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked each day,

1 including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANTS
2 were able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS'
3 timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in order to avoid paying
4 these employees for all hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay,
5 missed meal breaks and missed rest breaks.

6 56. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time,
7 forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without
8 compensation at the applicable pay rates.

9 57. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
10 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
11 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal breaks when in fact the employees were not
13 at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of DEFENDANTS'
14 uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30) minute off-duty meal
15 breaks each day or otherwise compensating them for missed meal breaks.

16 58. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to
17 them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit for the time the
18 timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay
19 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with
20 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

21 **L. Reporting Time Violations**

22 59. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
23 EMPLOYEES to report to work, but were furnished less than half their scheduled shift's worth of
24 work and were not paid reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040,
25 subdivision (A). Specifically, Subdivision 5(A) states, "(A) Each workday an employee is required
26 to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said
27 employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or
28 scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at

1 the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage.” In addition,
2 when DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to engage in
3 additional work, this sometimes resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday. In
4 such a circumstance of a second reporting for work in a single workday, DEFENDANTS failed to
5 pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040. Subdivision
6 5(B) states: “If an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and
7 is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, said employee shall be paid
8 for two (2) hours at the employee’s regular rate of pay, which shall be not less than the minimum
9 wage.” Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(B).

10 **M. Tip Pooling**

11 60. During the PAGA PERIOD, pursuant to DEFENDANTS’ company policies and
12 practices, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to forfeit gratuities left
13 for them by customers to DEFENDANTS’ agents who provided no service to the customers that
14 resulted in the gratuity. DEFENDANTS routinely added gratuity tips and service charges to its
15 food and beverage bills. These gratuities and service charges reasonably appear to be gratuities
16 for the service staff. It is typical and customary in the hospitality industry that establishments
17 impose gratuity charges on the food and beverage bill. Thus, when customers paid these charges,
18 it is reasonable for them to have believed they were gratuities to be paid to the service staff.
19 Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the custom in the food and
20 beverage industry that gratuities are paid for food and beverage service, customers paid these
21 charges reasonably believing they were remitted to the service staff. However, DEFENDANTS
22 have not remitted the total proceeds of these gratuities to the non-managerial employees who
23 serve the food and beverages. Instead, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of using a
24 portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service employees. As a result,
25 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES have not received the total proceeds of the
26 gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law.

27 61. DEFENDANTS are generally in the business of owning and operating a restaurant.
28 During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were in the

1 “chain of service” and earned gratuities based on their service for their customers. However,
2 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forced to forfeit portions of their gratuities,
3 which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANTS’ employees who were not in the chain of
4 service from which the gratuity resulted. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
5 contend that any gratuities kept by DEFENDANTS’ non-service employees were illegal and in
6 violation of California law because PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES provided
7 the service for to whom the gratuity should have been paid.

8 62. California Labor Code § 351 establishes the requirements for an employer
9 regarding the payment of gratuities. Specifically, gratuities are the sole property of the employees.
10 California Labor Code § 351 expressly prohibits employers and their agents from collecting,
11 taking, or receiving any portion of a gratuity. California Labor Code § 350(e) defines the term
12 “gratuity” as including any money that has been paid or given or left for an employee by a patron
13 of a business over and above the actual amount due the business for services rendered or for
14 goods, food, drink or articles sold or served to such patron. Labor Code § 353 requires employers
15 to keep accurate records of all gratuities they receive, directly or indirectly.

16 63. Although tip pooling is not expressly prohibited by the Labor Code, employees
17 who mandate tip pooling must only distribute pooled tips to employees in the “chain of service.”
18 By distributing tips to employees who were not in the “chain of service,” DEFENDANTS have
19 violated and continue to violate the legal requirements for handling pooled tips.

20 **N. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

21 64. On December 23, 2025 and February 24, 2026, PLAINTIFF caused written requests
22 via certified mail to be delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFF’S personnel and employment
23 records, including but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized
24 pay stubs; (4) time records; and (5) PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

25 65. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their
26 personnel records, payroll records, time records, employment contract, and entire employment file
27 within thirty (30) days of their requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this
28 complaint, DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount

1 of \$750 pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 226 and 1198.5. DEFENDANTS violated
2 California Labor Code Sections 226, 432, and 1198.5 by failing to respond and provide
3 PLAINTIFF with their employment file. Labor Code Section 226(b) requires employers to make
4 payroll records available to employees upon reasonable request. Labor Code Section 226(c) further
5 requires that the employer comply with the request for records as soon as practicable, but no later
6 than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of request. Labor Code Section 226(f) entitles
7 employees to recover civil penalties of \$750 against an employer who violates these requirements.
8 Labor Code Section 432 also entitles an employee to receive copies of any signed documents
9 related to the obtaining or holding of employment. Finally, pursuant to the applicable Industrial
10 Welfare Commission wage orders, DEFENDANTS are required to maintain accurate records for
11 employees, including time records, and such records must be made readily available for inspection
12 by the employee upon a reasonable request. Section 1198.5 states that employees (and former
13 employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer “related to the
14 employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must allow
15 inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request. As a result, PLAINTIFF is now entitled
16 to and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance with California Labor Code Sections 226,
17 432, 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and applicable statutory penalties and an award
18 of attorneys’ fees and costs for bringing this action.

19 66. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
20 off-duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for PLAINTIFF’S rest and meal
21 periods. PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than
22 five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS
23 failed to provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which
24 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS
25 provided PLAINTIFF with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call
26 for the rest break. DEFENDANTS’ policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during
27 what was supposed to be PLAINTIFF’S off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited
28 meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS’

1 strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with
2 paystubs that failed to comply with California Labor Code Section 226. Further, DEFENDANTS
3 also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the personal expenses
4 incurred for the use of PLAINTIFF'S personal cell phone, on behalf of and in furtherance of
5 PLAINTIFF'S employment with DEFENDANTS. Additionally, DEFENDANTS failed to provide
6 and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their personnel records, payroll records, time records,
7 employment contracts, and entire employment file within (30) days of all their requests on
8 December 23, 2025 and February 24, 2026. To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid
9 PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to PLAINTIFF or
10 any penalty wages owed to PLAINTIFF under California Labor Code Section 203. The amount in
11 controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

14 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 *et seq.*)**

15 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF against all DEFENDANTS)**

16 67. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
17 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

18 68. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor
19 laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's
20 labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally
21 a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The
22 purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing"
23 citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California
24 Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as
25 private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." (Stats. 2003, ch.
26 906, § 1.) Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

1 69. At all relevant times, for the reasons described herein and others, PLAINTIFF and
2 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS within the
3 meaning of Labor Code Section 2699(c).

4 70. Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (k) authorize an AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, like
5 PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF and other current or former employees, to bring a civil
6 action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3

7 71. PLAINTIFF complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
8 Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated March 20, 2026, PLAINTIFF
9 gave written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and to
10 DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated,
11 including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. (See Exhibit #1.)

12 72. As of the date of this complaint, more than sixty-five (65) days after serving the
13 LWDA with notice of DEFENDANTS’ violations, the LWDA has not provided any notice by
14 certified mail of its intent to investigate the DEFENDANTS’ alleged violations as mandated by
15 Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(A). Accordingly, pursuant to Labor Code Section
16 2699.3(a)(2)(A), PLAINTIFF may commence and is authorized to pursue this cause of action.

17 73. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), PLAINTIFF and the
18 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANTS’ violations of
19 Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7,
20 246, 351, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802
21 and 2804 in the following amounts:

22 a. For violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and 204, up to (\$200)
23 per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period [penalty per Labor Code
24 Section 2699(f)];

25 b. For violations of Labor Code Section 226(a), a civil penalty in the amount
26 of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for
27 any initial violation and one thousand dollars for each subsequent violation
28 [penalty per Labor Code Section 226.3];

1 c. For violations of Labor Code Sections 204, a civil penalty in the amount of
2 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for any initial
3 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for
4 each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 210];

5 d. For violations of Labor Code Sections 226.7, 510 and 512, a civil penalty
6 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid AGGRIEVED
7 EMPLOYEE for the initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
8 underpaid AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty
9 per Labor Code Section 558];

10 e. For violations of Labor Code Section 1174(d), a civil penalty in the amount
11 of five hundred (\$500) dollars for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE [penalty
12 per Labor Code Section 1174.5].

13 f. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and 1199,
14 a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
15 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two
16 hundred dollars fifty (\$250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay
17 period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 1197.1].

18 74. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically
19 provided, Labor Code Section 2699(f) imposes upon DEFENDANTS a penalty of up to two
20 hundred dollars (\$200) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period. PLAINTIFF and the
21 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs in
22 connection with their claims for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(k)(1).
23
24
25
26
27
28

///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

3 1. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit to the extent permitted by law,
4 including pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699, *et seq.*;

5 2. For civil penalties to the extent permitted by law pursuant to the Labor Code under
6 the Private Attorneys General Act; and

7 3. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

8
9 DATED: May 26, 2026

10 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

11 By:  _____

12 Shani O. Zakay, Esq.

13 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

March 20, 2026

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendants
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

LABOR FORCE GROUP LLC

c/o Corporation Service Company
251 Little Falls Drive
Wilmington, DE 19808

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 2308 6686 51

QWICK, INC.

c/o 3550 N Goldwater Blvd, #1154
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 2308 6686 68

c/o Corporation Service Company
251 Little Falls Drive
Wilmington, DE 19808

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 2308 6684 77

GIGPRO INC

c/o Bonnie Gerchicoff
2020 El Cajon Boulevard, #308
San Diego, CA 92104

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 3646 5439 5439 52

c/o Northwest Registered Agent Service, Inc.
8 The Green, Ste B
Dover, DE 19901

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 3646 5439 69

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 351, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2804, and Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

This notice is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code Section 2699.3. Our offices represent Plaintiff FELIPE RANGEL (“Plaintiff”) and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant LABOR FORCE GROUP LLC (“Defendant Labor Force Group”),

Defendant QWICK, INC. (“Defendant Qwick”), and Defendant GIGPRO INC (“Defendant GigPro”) (hereinafter, collectively, “Defendants”) in California from September of 2024 to November of 2025 as a banquet server and worked for Defendants at various locations in San Diego, California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to payment of all wages and the legally required meal and rest breaks.

Plaintiff alleges that within the past year, Plaintiff personally suffered violations of the following Labor Code Sections as a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff for all time worked, provide Plaintiff with compliant meal periods, provide Plaintiff with compliant rest periods, provide Plaintiff with accurate itemized wage statements that facially comply with the requirements provided for in Labor Code Section 226, furnish wages to Plaintiff with the frequency as set forth under Labor Code Section 204, and reimburse Plaintiff for necessary business expenses pursuant to Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 351, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804. These violations are actionable under California Labor Code Section 2699.3.

The information below provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency’s reference. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as any person currently or formerly employed by Defendant Labor Force Group and/or Defendant Qwick and/or Defendant GigPro who performed work in California and against whom one or more of the alleged violations listed above were committed during the relevant claim period (“Aggrieved Employees”). Plaintiff believes this group to be comprised of all current and former non-exempt employees who performed work for Defendant Labor Force Group and/or Defendant Qwick and/or Defendant GigPro in California during the period beginning one year prior to the date of this Notice and continuing through the present.

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, Defendants as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked, failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for off-the-clock work, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees meal and rest premiums at the regular rate of pay, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees redeemed sick pay at the regular rate of pay, failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for business expenses, and failed to issue to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Defendants’ uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows Defendants to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law.

Meal Period Violations: Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, Defendants

were required to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the last year, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work without paying them for all the time they were under Defendants' control. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be Plaintiff's off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where Plaintiff did not even receive a partial lunch. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. Defendants' uniform policy and practice not to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

During the last year, as a result of their rigorous work schedules and Defendants' inadequate staffing practices, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by Defendants to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by Defendants' business records. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and Defendants' inadequate staffing, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with Defendants' strict corporate policy and practice.

Rest Period Violations: From time to time during the past year, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and Defendants' inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were from time to time denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, from time to time denied a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and from time to time denied and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. When they were provided with rest breaks, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on duty and/or on call, and not fully relieved of all duties. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were also not provided with one-hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and Defendants' inadequate staffing, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by Defendants and Defendants' managers. For example, during the pay period of August 4, 2025 to August 10, 2025, Plaintiff was denied at least one rest period. However, as evidenced by the example below, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff a rest period premium.



Labor Force Group LLC
 3550 N Goldwater Blvd #1154
 Scottsdale, AZ 85251
 (602)325-3359
 92-0758074

Earnings statement

Pay period: 8/4/2025 - 8/10/2025

Disbursement: Direct deposit to account [REDACTED]

Check date: August 13th, 2025

Felipe Rangel

Summary

Description	Current	Year to date
Gross Pay	\$248.12	\$1,468.22
Total Deductions	\$0.00	\$0.00
Employee Taxes	\$21.96	\$129.87
Net Pay	\$226.16	\$1,338.35
Check Amount	\$226.16	

Unreimbursed Business Expenses: Defendants as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for required business expenses incurred by the Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of Defendants. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment. California Labor Code Section 2802 expressly states that "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."

Within the last year, in the course of their employment, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to incur personal expenses as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties for the use of their personal cell phones. Specifically, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were required to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell phones,. However, Defendants unlawfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with Defendants, the Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones, all on behalf of and for the benefit of Defendants. For example, during the pay period of July 28, 2025 to August 3, 2025, Defendants required Plaintiff to use Plaintiff's personal cell phone. However, as evidenced by the example below, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff for the use of Plaintiff's personal cell phone.



Labor Force Group LLC
3550 N Goldwater Blvd #1154
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
(602)325-3359
92-0758074

Earnings statement

Pay period: 7/28/2025 - 8/3/2025
Disbursement: Direct deposit to account [REDACTED]
Check date: August 6th, 2025

Felipe Rangel
[REDACTED]

Summary

Description	Current	Year to date
Gross Pay	\$126.00	\$1,220.10
Total Deductions	\$0.00	\$0.00
Employee Taxes	\$11.15	\$107.91
Net Pay	\$114.85	\$1,112.19
Check Amount	\$114.85	

Employee taxes withheld

Employee tax	Current	Year to date
Federal Income Tax	\$0.00	\$0.00
Social Security	\$7.81	\$75.60
Medicare	\$1.83	\$17.68
Medicare Additional	\$0.00	\$0.00
California Temporary Disability Insurance Tax	\$1.51	\$14.63
Total	\$11.15	\$107.91

Shifts

Work location: Continental Catering , USS Midway, 910 N Harbor Dr, San Diego, CA 92101

Date	Type	Rate	Earned
11:00 PM 8/02/2025	Aug 03: Banquet Server @ Continental Catering	6 hours at \$21.00	\$126.00

Policy type: California Sick Time(Sick)

Description	Current	YTD
Accrued	0.19	1.79
Usage	0	1.75
Balance as of 8/3/2025		3.54

Wage Statement Violations: California Labor Code Section 226 requires an employer to furnish its employees and accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions, (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 the employee's 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. From time to time during the last year, when Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements that included all required elements listed above. Further, as evidenced below, Defendants from time to time failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements that provided all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(9).



Labor Force Group LLC
3550 N Goldwater Blvd #1154
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
(602)325-3359
92-0758074

Earnings statement

Pay period: 10/13/2025 - 10/19/2025
Disbursement: **Direct deposit to account** [REDACTED]
Check date: **October 22nd, 2025**

Felipe Rangel

Summary

Description	Current	Year to date
Gross Pay	\$126.31	\$2,220.52
Total Deductions	\$0.00	\$0.00
Employee Taxes	\$11.18	\$196.46
Net Pay	\$115.13	\$2,024.06
Check Amount	\$115.13	

Employee taxes withheld

Employee tax	Current	Year to date
Federal Income Tax	\$0.00	\$0.00
Social Security	\$7.83	\$137.03
Medicare	\$1.83	\$32.19
Medicare Additional	\$0.00	\$0.00
California Temporary Disability Insurance Tax	\$1.52	\$26.04
Total	\$11.18	\$196.46

Shifts

Work location: Estancia La Jolla, 9700 N Torrey Pines Rd, La Jolla, CA 92037

Date	Type	Rate	Earned
10:00 PM 10/19/2025	Oct 18: Banquet Server @ Estancia La Jolla	5.74138888888889 hours at \$22.00	\$126.31

Policy type: California Sick Time(Sick)

Description	Current	YTD
Accrued	0.19	3.39
Usage	0	1.75
Balance as of 10/19/2025		5.14

As a result, Defendants issued Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with wage statements that violate California Labor Code Section 226. Further, Defendants' violations are knowing and intentional; they were not isolated due to an unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations: During the last year, from time-to-time, Defendants failed and continue to fail to accurately pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. During the last year, from time-to-time Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including but not limited, to sending and receiving work-related communications. This resulted in Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees having to work while off-the-clock. Defendants directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-clock work performed by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees. Defendants controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications, assignments, and employment conditions of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

Defendants were able to track the amount of time Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees spent working; however, Defendants failed to document, track, or pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned and owed for all the work they performed. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were non-exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code. Defendants' policies and practices deprived Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed for the off-the-clock work activities. Because Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8) hours per day, Defendants' policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at Defendants' direction, control, and benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, undergoing pre-shift and post-shift work. Defendants' uniform policy and practice to not pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

Reporting Time Violations: During the last year, Defendants from time to time required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report to work, but were furnished less than half their scheduled shift's worth of work and/or less than two (2) hours of work for a second reporting, and were not paid reporting time pay as required by California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 11040, subdivisions (A) and (B) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Subdivision 5(A) states, "(A) Each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage." Subdivision 5(B) states: "If an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, said employee shall be paid for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall be not less than the minimum wage."

Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and Redeemed Sick Pay: From time to time during the last year, Defendants failed and continue to fail to accurately calculate and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. Defendants' uniform policy and practice not to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an employee's performance. The second component of Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' compensation was Defendants' non-discretionary incentive program that paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees incentive

wages based on their performance for Defendants. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by Defendants. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay periods where Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked overtime, double time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-discretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees by Defendants.

Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek. Defendants' conduct, as articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of California Labor Code Section 246 the underpayment of which is recoverable under California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or 204.

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, Defendants as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rate of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay as required by California law which allowed Defendants to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law.

Unlawful Deductions: During the last year, Defendants, from time-to-time, unlawfully deducted wages from Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' pay without explanations and without authorization to do so or notice to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code Section 221.

Timekeeping Manipulation: During the last year, Defendants, from time-to-time, did not have an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the actual time Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal and rest breaks. As a result, Defendants were able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally alter the time recorded in Defendants' timekeeping system for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed rest breaks. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, from time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed Defendants to alter employee time records

by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in Defendants' timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal breaks when in fact the employees were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of Defendants' uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30) minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensating them for missed meal breaks. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at Defendants' direction, control and benefit for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. Defendants' uniform policy and practice to not pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

Unlawful Rounding Practices: During the last year, Defendants did not have in place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours. Specifically, Defendants had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted in Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees being undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, Defendants were able to and did in fact unlawfully and unilaterally round the time recorded in Defendants' timekeeping system for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

Further, the mutability of Defendants' timekeeping system and unlawful rounding policy and practice resulted in Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' time being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, Defendants' unlawful rounding policy and practice caused Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break.

Untimely Payment of Wages: Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 204, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, from time to time, did not receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within the permissible time period. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 201, "If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting." Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201 and 202. To date, Defendants have not fully paid Plaintiff the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to Plaintiff or any penalty wages owed to Plaintiff under California Labor Code Section 203.

Sick Pay Violations: California Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An 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 as specified in this

section.” Further, California Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From time to time, including within the last year, Defendants failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with sick days and/or paid sick leave. As of January 1, 2024, Defendants failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to time, including within the last year, Defendants violated California Labor Code Section 246 by failing to furnish Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.

Tip Pooling Violations: During the last year, pursuant to Defendants’ company policies and practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were forced to forfeit gratuities left for them by customers to Defendants’ agents who provided no service to the customers that resulted in the gratuity. Defendants routinely added gratuity tips and service charges to its food and beverage bills. These gratuities and service charges reasonably appear to be gratuities for the service staff. It is typical and customary in the hospitality industry that establishments impose gratuity charges on the food and beverage bill. Thus, when customers paid these charges, it is reasonable for them to have believed they were gratuities to be paid to the service staff. Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the custom in the food and beverage industry that gratuities are paid for food and beverage service, customers paid these charges reasonably believing they were remitted to the service staff. However, Defendants have not remitted the total proceeds of these gratuities to the non-managerial employees who serve the food and beverages. Instead, Defendants have a policy and practice of using a portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service employees. As a result, Plaintiff and the aggrieved Employees have not received the total proceeds of the gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law. Defendants are generally in the business of owning and operating a restaurant. During the last year, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were in the “chain of service” and earned gratuities based on their service for their customers. However, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees forced to forfeit portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by Defendants’ employees who were not in the chain of service from which the gratuity resulted. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees contend that any gratuities kept by Defendants’ non-service employees were illegal and in violation of California law because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees provided the service for to whom the gratuity should have been paid.

California Labor Code § 351 establishes the requirements for an employer regarding the payment of gratuities. Specifically, gratuities are the sole property of the employees. California Labor Code § 351 expressly prohibits employers and their agents from collecting, taking, or receiving any portion of a gratuity. California Labor Code § 350(e) defines the term “gratuity” as including any money that has been paid or given or left for an employee by a patron of a business over and above the actual amount due the business for services rendered or for goods, food, drink or articles sold or served to such patron. Labor Code § 353 requires employers to keep accurate records of all gratuities they receive, directly or indirectly. Although tip pooling is not expressly prohibited by the Labor Code, employees who mandate tip pooling must only distribute pooled tips to employees in the “chain of service.” By distributing tips to employees who were not in the “chain of service,” Defendants have violated and continue to violate the legal requirements for handling pooled tips.

Personnel File Violations: On December 23, 2025 and February 24, 2026, Plaintiff caused written

requests via certified mail to be delivered to Defendants for Plaintiff's personnel and employment records, including but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; (4) time records; and (5) Plaintiff's complete employment file. Defendants failed to provide and/or make available to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees their personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty (30) days of their requests stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this notice, Defendants have still failed to pay Plaintiff the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750. Defendants violated California Labor Code Sections 226, 432 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to respond and provide Plaintiff with their employment file. Section 226 requires employers to make payroll records available to employees upon reasonable request. Section 432 entitles employees to receive copies of any signed documents relating to the obtaining or holding of employment. Section 1198.5 states that employees (and former employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer "related to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the employee." Employers must allow inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request.

Defendants also include DOES 1-50, the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise, are presently unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. To the extent that entities and/or individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code Sections including, but not limited to 558, 558.1, and 1197.1—Plaintiff reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals, including DOES 1-50, responsible for the violations at issue.

Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this notice. Consequently, Defendants are on notice that Plaintiff continues their investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein.

This notice is provided in compliance with California Labor Code Section 2699.3, *et seq.*

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Very truly yours,



ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APC

Shani Zakay, Esq.