

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)

[shani@zakaylaw.com](mailto:shani@zakaylaw.com)

Nicole Noursamadi (State Bar #357246)

[nicole@zakaylaw.com](mailto:nicole@zakaylaw.com)

Eden Zakay (State Bar #339536)

[eden@zakaylaw.com](mailto:eden@zakaylaw.com)

Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)

[jaclyn@zakaylaw.com](mailto: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 ALAMEDA**

BRANDON GRAYS, an individual, on behalf  
of Plaintiff, and on behalf of all persons  
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

WESTCOAST CHILDREN'S CLINIC, a  
California corporation; and DOES 1-50,  
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 26CV178725

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et seq*;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510 *et seq*;
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
- 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;

09/03/2026

Chad Flake, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court

By: Chad Flake Deputy  
D. Harbour

- 1 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES  
2 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN  
3 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;  
4 9) FAILURE TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF  
5 EMPLOYEE RECORDS IN VIOLATION  
6 OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226, 432, 1198.5  
7 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE  
8 ORDER.  
9 10) VIOLATIONS OF THE PRIVATE  
10 ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR  
11 CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.]

12 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

13 PLAINTIFF BRANDON GRAYS (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of PLAINTIFF  
14 and all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief,  
15 except for their own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

16 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

17 1. Defendant WESTCOAST CHILDREN'S CLINIC (“DEFENDANT” and/or  
18 “DEFENDANTS”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted  
19 and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

20 2. DEFENDANTS own and operate a children’s community psychology clinic in  
21 California, including in the County of Alameda, where PLAINTIFF worked.

22 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from September of  
23 2023 to October of 2025, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the  
24 legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all  
25 time worked.

26 4. PLAINTIFF reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new  
27 Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v.*  
28 *American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and a California  
class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California  
and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the

1 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of the original Complaint and ending on the date  
2 as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate  
3 claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

4 6. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and a CALIFORNIA  
5 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during the  
6 CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice which failed to lawfully  
7 compensate these employees. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice alleged herein was an  
8 unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANTS retained and continue  
9 to retain wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.  
10 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining  
11 such conduct by DEFENDANTS in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the other  
12 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANTS'  
13 past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

14 7. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,  
15 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently  
16 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious names  
17 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend  
18 this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50,  
19 inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that  
20 information and belief alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including  
21 DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of  
22 the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

23 8. The agents, servants and/or employees of DEFENDANTS and each of them acting  
24 on behalf of DEFENDANTS acted within the course and scope of his, her, or its authority as the  
25 agent, servant and/or employee of DEFENDANTS, and personally participated in the conduct  
26 alleged herein on behalf of the DEFENDANTS with respect to the conduct alleged herein.  
27 Consequently, the acts of each DEFENDANT are legally attributable to the other DEFENDANTS  
28 and all DEFENDANTS are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other members of

1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the  
2 DEFENDANTS' agents, servants and/or employees.

3 9. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of  
4 PLAINTIFF'S employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code Section 558, who violated  
5 or caused to be violated, a Section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any  
6 provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission  
7 and, as such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code  
8 Section 558, at all relevant times.

9 10. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers 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 11. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,  
15 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANTS retained and continue to retain  
16 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

17 12. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction  
18 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANTS in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and other  
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANTS'  
20 past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

### 21 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

22 13. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil  
23 Procedure Section 410.10 and California Business and Professions Code Section 17203. This action  
24 is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of  
25 DEFENDANTS pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382.

26 14. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,  
27 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS operate in locations across California, employ  
28

1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this county, and committed the wrongful  
2 conduct herein alleged in this county against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

### 3 **THE CONDUCT**

4 15. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
5 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a  
6 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically  
7 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate  
8 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest periods,  
9 failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked,  
10 failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for off-the-  
11 clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
12 overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members  
13 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal and rest premiums at the regular rate of pay, failed to pay  
14 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS redeemed sick pay at the regular  
15 rate of pay, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
16 for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all  
18 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time  
19 worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policies and practices are intended to  
20 purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law  
21 which allows DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who  
22 comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA  
23 CLASS against DEFENDANTS, the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

#### 24 **A. Meal Period Violations**

25 16. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS were  
26 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members for all their time worked,  
27 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all  
28 the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS

1 PERIOD, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to work  
2 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically,  
3 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be  
4 PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not even  
5 receive a partial lunch. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members  
6 forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being  
7 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates.  
8 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
9 CLASS members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

10 17. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work  
11 schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other  
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-duty  
13 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other  
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for  
15 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,  
16 DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members with a second  
17 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANTS  
18 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other  
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-duty"  
20 meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other  
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call.  
22 Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
23 members to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-  
24 related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal breaks.  
25 DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with  
26 legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records. As a result of their  
27 rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other members  
28

1 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in  
2 accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

3 **B. Rest Period Violations**

4 18. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other  
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without  
6 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and  
7 DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied  
8 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four  
9 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts  
10 worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest  
11 period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to  
12 time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
13 members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. Further,  
14 DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
15 members to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-  
16 related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest breaks. PLAINTIFF  
17 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*  
18 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing,  
19 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were from time to time denied their proper  
20 rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

21 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

22 19. DEFENDANTS as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,  
23 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF and  
24 the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required business expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF  
25 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members in direct consequence of discharging their duties on  
26 behalf of DEFENDANTS. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to  
27 indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment.  
28 California Labor Code Section 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her

1 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence  
2 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer,  
3 even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them  
4 to be unlawful.”

5 20. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other  
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell  
7 phones and home internet, as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically,  
8 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were required to use their personal cell  
9 phones and home internet, in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS  
10 unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members for the use  
11 of their personal cell phones and home internet. As a result, in the course of their employment with  
12 DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members incurred unreimbursed  
13 business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal  
14 cell phones and home internet, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS.

15 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

16 21. California Labor Code Section 226 required an employer to furnish its employees  
17 an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours  
18 worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions,  
19 (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the  
20 name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee’s Social Security number or an  
21 employee identification number other than a Social Security number, (8) the name and address of  
22 the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay  
23 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

24 22. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other  
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed  
26 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed  
27 to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members with complete and accurate  
28 wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked

1 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time  
2 worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest  
3 periods.

4 23. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide  
5 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with  
6 California Labor Code Section 226.

7 24. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
8 members with wage statements that violate California Labor Code section 226(a)(1)-(9). Further,  
9 DEFENDANTS' violations are knowing and intentional, and were not isolated due to an  
10 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

12 25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS failed and  
13 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
14 for all hours worked.

15 26. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required  
16 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift  
17 work, including but not limited to, sending and receiving work-related communications and  
18 performing preparation work prior to the start of scheduled shifts. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and  
19 other CALIFORNIA CLASS members having to work while off-the-clock.

20 27. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-  
21 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

22 28. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,  
23 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
24 members.

25 29. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other  
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to  
27 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all  
28 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

1           30. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-exempt  
2 employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

3           31. DEFENDANTS' policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other  
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS members of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed  
5 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight  
7 (8) hours per day, DEFENDANTS' policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

8           32. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF'S and the other  
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS members' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

10          33. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
11 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control, and benefit  
12 for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, sending and receiving  
13 work-related communications and performing preparation work prior to the start of scheduled  
14 shifts. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of  
15 the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is  
16 evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

19          34. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and  
20 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
21 members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and  
22 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members  
23 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime  
24 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.  
25 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS members at  
26 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick  
27 pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

1           35. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times  
2 their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were  
3 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an employee’s  
4 performance.

5           36. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
6 members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid  
7 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members incentive wages based on their  
8 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees  
9 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance  
10 goals set by DEFENDANTS.

11           37. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay  
12 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double  
13 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-  
14 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus  
15 compensation as part of the employee’s “regular rate of pay” and/or calculated all hours worked  
16 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the  
17 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As  
18 a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
19 CLASS members must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted in  
20 a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period  
21 premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
22 members by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid  
23 sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of  
24 pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the  
25 employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated  
26 herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for  
27 purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of California Labor Code Section 246, the  
28

1 underpayment of which is recoverable under California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or  
2 204.

3 38. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
4 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a  
5 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to  
6 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate  
7 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick  
8 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an  
9 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling  
10 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANTS, the CLASS  
11 PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

12 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

13 39. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, unlawfully deducted wages from  
14 PLAINTIFF’S and CALIFORNIA CLASS members’ pay without explanation and without  
15 authorization to do so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members. As a  
16 result, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code Section 221.

17 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

18 40. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an  
19 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of  
20 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the  
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal  
22 and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and  
23 unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS’ timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and  
24 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all  
25 hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and  
26 missed rest breaks.

1           41. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from  
2 time to time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and  
3 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

4           42. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter  
5 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'  
6 timekeeping system to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the  
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal breaks when, in fact, the employees  
8 were not provided an off-duty meal break at all times. This practice is a direct result of  
9 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)  
10 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise failing to compensate them for missed meal  
11 breaks.

12           43. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
13 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit  
14 for the time that the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and  
15 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours  
16 worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

17       **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

18           44. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in place  
19 an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other  
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including  
21 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and  
22 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members being  
23 undercompensated for all their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did in  
24 fact unlawfully and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system  
25 for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these  
26 employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime  
27 worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time,  
28

1 forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately  
2 recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

3 45. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful  
4 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members' time  
5 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding  
6 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to perform work as  
7 ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-  
8 duty meal break.

9 **J. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

10 46. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 204, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA  
11 CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. PLAINTIFF  
12 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not receive payment of all wages,  
13 including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and  
14 rest period premium wages within the permissible time period.

15 47. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 201, "If an employer discharges an  
16 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately."  
17 Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his  
18 or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee  
19 has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is  
20 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting." PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
21 members were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of  
22 their discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201  
23 and 202.

24 48. 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 CALIFORNIA CLASS members whose  
26 employment ended during the CLASS PERIOD.

27 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

28 49. California Labor Code Section 246(a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or

1 after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year  
2 from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”  
3 Further, California Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements.  
4 From time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place to provide  
5 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick  
6 leave. As of January 1, 2024, DEFENDANTS failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to  
7 provide and allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

8 50. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees  
9 with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to  
10 time, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF  
11 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth the amount of  
12 paid sick leave available.

13 **L. Reporting Time Violations**

14 51. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other  
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to report to work, but were furnished less than half their  
16 scheduled shift’s worth of work and were not paid reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code  
17 Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subdivision (A). Specifically, Subdivision 5(A) states, “(A) Each workday an  
18 employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less  
19 than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the  
20 usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4)  
21 hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage.” In  
22 addition, when DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members  
23 to engage in additional work, this sometimes resulted in a second reporting for work in a single  
24 workday. In such a circumstance of a second reporting for work in a single workday,  
25 DEFENDANTS failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs.,  
26 tit. 8 § 11040. Subdivision 5(B) states: “If an employee is required to report for work a second time  
27 in any one workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, said  
28 employee shall be paid for two (2) hours at the employee’s regular rate of pay, which shall be not

1 less than the minimum wage.” Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(B).

2 **M. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

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

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

1           54. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take  
2 off-duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for their rest and meal periods.  
3 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)  
4 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to  
5 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which they were required  
6 by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF  
7 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.  
8 DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was  
9 supposed to be their off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks  
10 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy  
11 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to  
12 comply with California Labor Code Section 226. Further, DEFENDANTS also failed to reimburse  
13 PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the personal expenses incurred for the use  
14 of their personal cell phone and home internet, on behalf of and in furtherance of their employment  
15 with DEFENDANTS. Additionally, DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to  
16 PLAINTIFF their personnel records, payroll records, time records, employment contracts, and  
17 entire employment file within thirty (30) days of all their request on December 23, 2025. To date,  
18 DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time  
19 compensation still owed to PLAINTIFF, or any penalty wages owed to PLAINTIFF under  
20 California Labor Code Section 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does  
21 not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

#### 22                                   **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

23           55. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and a California  
24 class defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California  
25 and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the  
26 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of the original Complaint and ending on the date  
27 as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD").  
28

1           56.     PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members have uniformly been  
2 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to  
3 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,  
4 illegal meal and rest period policies, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to  
5 compensate for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to  
6 maintain required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and  
7 expenses.

8           57.     The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is  
9 impractical.

10          58.     Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANTS' conduct, including  
11 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately  
12 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the  
13 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failure to provide legally  
14 compliant meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide  
15 accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum wage and  
16 overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions affecting solely  
17 any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the class are:

- 18           a.     Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant meal period policies and  
19                 practices;
- 20           b.     Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant rest period policies and  
21                 practices;
- 22           c.     Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
23                 members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 24           d.     Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
25                 members accurate overtime wages;
- 26           e.     Whether DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
27                 members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;

- 1 f. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA  
2 CLASS members for required business expenses;
- 3 g. Whether DEFENDANTS issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 4 h. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by systematically  
5 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA  
6 CLASS for all time worked;
- 7 i. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition by systematically  
8 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other  
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS members, even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the benefit  
10 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to  
11 permit this work;
- 12 j. Whether DEFENDANTS committed an act of unfair competition in violation of  
13 California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”), by  
14 failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
15 with the legally required meal and rest periods.

16 59. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as a  
17 result of DEFENDANTS’ conduct and actions alleged herein.

18 60. PLAINTIFF’S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and  
19 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

20 61. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the  
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

22 62. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action  
23 litigation.

24 63. Further, PLAINTIFF’S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the  
25 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

26 64. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of the  
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANTS are  
28

1 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries  
2 sustained.

3         65. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS members  
4 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual  
5 issues relating to liability and damages.

6         66. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
7 adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all class members is impractical. Moreover,  
8 since the damages suffered by individual members of the class may be relatively small, the expense  
9 and burden of individual litigation makes it practically impossible for the members of the class  
10 individually to redress the wrongs done to them. Without class certification and determination of  
11 declaratory, injunctive, statutory, and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of  
12 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:

- 13             a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the  
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct  
15 for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,  
16             b. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
17 which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other  
18 members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability  
19 to protect their interests.

20         67. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an  
21 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the  
22 conduct of DEFENDANTS.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Unlawful Business Practices**

3 **(Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

4 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

5 68. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and  
6 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this  
7 Complaint.

8 69. DEFENDANTS are each a “person” as that term is defined under California  
9 Business and Professions Code Section 17201.

10 70. California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”)  
11 defines unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section  
12 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair  
13 competition as follows:

14 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition  
15 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such  
16 orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to  
17 prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair  
18 competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person  
19 in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired  
20 by means of such unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203).

21 71. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continue to  
22 engage in business practices which violate California law, including but not limited to, the  
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code  
24 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and  
25 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to California  
26 Business and Professions Code Section 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the  
27 conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

28 72. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS’ practices were unlawful and unfair  
in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressively unscrupulous  
or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which this

1 Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California  
2 Business and Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

3 73. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and  
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally  
5 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest  
6 periods, failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, and failed to reimburse all necessary  
7 business expenses incurred, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant  
8 to the applicable California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in  
9 violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this  
10 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to California Business and Professions  
11 Code Section 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

12 74. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unlawful,  
13 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the  
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with  
15 DEFENDANTS.

16 75. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and  
17 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide  
18 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as  
19 required by California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

20 76. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of PLAINTIFF and on behalf of each  
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal  
22 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for each  
23 workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10) hours  
24 of work.

25 77. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of PLAINTIFF and on behalf of each  
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was  
27 not timely provided as required by law.  
28

1           78. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,  
2 DEFENDANTS have obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the  
3 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and  
4 have deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the  
5 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANTS so as to allow DEFENDANTS  
6 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

7           79. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial  
8 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor  
9 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and  
10 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business  
11 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*

12           80. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,  
13 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which  
14 DEFENDANTS have acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair  
16 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

17           81. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further  
18 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair, and  
19 deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANTS from engaging in  
20 any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

21           82. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,  
22 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of  
23 DEFENDANTS. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a  
24 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other  
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal  
26 and economic harm unless DEFENDANTS are restrained from continuing to engage in these  
27 unlawful and unfair business practices.

28 ///

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

## 2

3

4

5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11

12  
1314  
15  
1617  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26  
27  
28

1           90. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS  
2 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time worked  
3 by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANTS acted in an  
4 illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the  
5 California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws  
6 and regulations.

7           91. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,  
8 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct  
9 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANTS.

10          92. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a  
12 failure to pay all earned wages.

13          93. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned  
14 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true  
15 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered  
16 and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them,  
17 and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

18          94. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.  
20 DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross  
21 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice  
22 and procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay  
23 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages for  
24 their time worked.

25          95. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor  
26 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked  
27 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANTS acted and continues to act  
28 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the  
2 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal  
3 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of  
4 these employees.

5 96. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request  
6 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment  
7 of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANTS, in a sum as provided by the California Labor  
8 Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined  
9 to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS members who have terminated their employment,  
10 DEFENDANTS' conduct also violates Labor Code Sections 201 and/or 202, and therefore these  
11 individuals are also entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code Section 203,  
12 which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS members.  
13 DEFENDANTS' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further,  
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members are entitled to seek and recover statutory  
15 costs.

### 16 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 17 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

18 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

19 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

20 97. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS reallege and  
21 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this  
22 Complaint.

23 98. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for  
24 DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial  
25 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to pay these employees for all  
26 overtime worked including work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve  
27 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.  
28

1           99. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 204, other applicable laws and  
2 regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

3           100. California Labor Code Section 510 provides that employees in California shall not  
4 be employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and/or more than forty (40) hours per  
5 workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts  
6 specified by law.

7           101. California Labor Code Section 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover  
8 unpaid wages, including minimum and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with  
9 the costs of suit. California Labor Code Section 1198 further states that the employment of an  
10 employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

11           102. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members  
12 were required by DEFENDANTS to work for DEFENDANTS and were not paid for all the time  
13 they worked, including overtime work.

14           103. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,  
15 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing  
16 a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and  
17 other CALIFORNIA CLASS members and denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the  
18 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime work  
19 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or  
20 forty (40) hours in any workweek.

21           104. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS  
22 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by  
23 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal  
24 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California  
25 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and  
26 regulations.

1           105. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,  
2 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct  
3 overtime compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANTS.

4           106. California Labor Code Section 515 sets out various categories of employees who are  
5 exempt from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to  
6 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the  
7 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining  
8 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein in this Complaint. Rather,  
9 PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on  
10 DEFENDANTS' violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of  
11 California.

12           107. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked than they were entitled to, constituting  
14 a failure to pay all earned wages.

15           108. DEFENDANTS failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the  
17 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and  
18 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were  
19 regularly required to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which  
20 DEFENDANTS failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business  
21 records and witnessed by employees.

22           109. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned  
23 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true  
24 amount of overtime they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA  
25 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently  
26 unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

27           110. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.

1 DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross  
2 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and  
3 procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF  
4 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their overtime  
5 worked.

6 111. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor  
7 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked  
8 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANTS acted and continues to act  
9 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the  
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the  
11 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal  
12 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of  
13 these employees.

14 112. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS request  
15 recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment  
16 of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANTS, in a sum as provided by the California Labor  
17 Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is determined to be  
18 owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS members who have terminated their employment,  
19 DEFENDANTS' conduct also violates California Labor Code Sections 201 and/or 202, and  
20 therefore these individuals are also entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code  
21 203, which penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANTS' conduct as alleged herein was willful,  
22 intentional, and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members  
23 are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 ///

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

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

3

4

5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24  
25  
26

28

116. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

**(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

**(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

117. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

118. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, 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 a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members for their rest periods as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with all the legally required paid rest periods is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

119. DEFENDANTS further violated California Labor Code Sections 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one

1 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that rest  
2 period was not provided.

3 120. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and  
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial, and  
5 seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

6 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

9 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

10 121. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and  
11 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this  
12 Complaint.

13 122. California Labor Code Section 226 provides that an employer must furnish  
14 employees with an "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 15 a. gross wages earned,  
16 b. total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation  
17 is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under  
18 subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare  
19 Commission,  
20 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee  
21 is paid on a piece-rate basis,  
22 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee  
23 may be aggregated and shown as one item,  
24 e. net wages earned,  
25 f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,  
26 g. the name of the employee and his or her Social Security number, except that by  
27 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her Social Security number or an  
28

employee identification number other than Social Security number may be shown on the itemized statement,

h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and

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

123. When DEFENDANTS did not accurately record PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members' missed meal and rest breaks, or paid inaccurate missed meal and rest break premiums, or did not pay for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 226 in that DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, 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, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

124. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS failed to provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(1)-(9).

125. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with California Labor Code Section 226(a)(1)-(9), causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

4 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

5 126. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and  
6 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this  
7 Complaint.

8 127. California Labor Code Section 200 provides that:

9 As used in this article:

10 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every  
11 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,  
task, piece, commission basis, or other method of calculation.

12 (e) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under  
13 contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the labor to  
be paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

14 128. California Labor Code Section 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer  
15 discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable  
16 immediately."

17 129. California Labor Code Section 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

18 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her  
employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours  
19 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  
20 of quitting. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without  
providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so  
21 requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the  
date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours  
22 of the notice of quitting.

23 130. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF'S or any CALIFORNIA CLASS  
24 members' employment contract.

25 131. California Labor Code Section 203 provides:

26 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with  
Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or  
27 who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date  
thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the  
28 wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

1           132. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS members  
2 terminated, and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages to these employees who  
3 missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

4           133. Therefore, as provided by California Labor Code Section 203, on behalf of  
5 themselves and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has ended,  
6 PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty (30) days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time  
7 of termination for all employees who terminated employment during the CLASS PERIOD and  
8 demand an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed  
9 by law.

10                                   **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11                                   **Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

12                                   **(Cal. Lab. Code § 2802)**

13                                   **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS)**

14           134. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and  
15 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this  
16 Complaint.

17           135. California Labor Code Section 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:  
18           An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or  
19           losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her  
20           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.

21           136. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS violated California  
22 Labor Code Section 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the  
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties  
24 for DEFENDANTS' benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the  
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of  
26 their personal cell phones and home internet, all on behalf of and for the benefit of  
27 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
28 CLASS members to use their personal cell phones and home internet, to execute their essential job

1 duties on behalf of DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy, practice and procedure was  
2 to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses resulting  
3 from the use of their personal cell phones and home internet, within the course and scope of their  
4 employment for DEFENDANTS. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job  
5 duties. DEFENDANTS are estopped by DEFENDANTS' conduct to assert any waiver of this  
6 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the  
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS members, DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF  
8 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under  
9 the laws and regulations of California.

10 137. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred  
11 by them and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for  
12 DEFENDANTS, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANTS, with interest at the  
13 statutory rate and costs under California Labor Code Section 2802.

#### 14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### 15 **Failure To Permit Inspection of Employee Records**

16 **(Cal. Lab. §§ 226, 432, 1198.5 and Applicable IWC Wage Orders)**

17 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF against all Defendants)**

18 138. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth  
19 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

20 139. Labor Code Section 226(b) requires employers to make payroll records available to  
21 employees upon reasonable request. Labor Code Section 226(c) further requires that the employer  
22 comply with the request for records as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21)  
23 calendar days from the date of request.

24 140. Labor Code Section 432 also entitles an employee to receive copies of any signed  
25 documents related to the obtaining or holding of employment.

26 141. Labor Code § 1198.5 states that employees (and former employees) have the right  
27 to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer "related to the employee's performance  
28

1 or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must allow inspection or copying  
2 within thirty (30) days of the request.

3 142. The applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders require employers to  
4 maintain accurate records for employees, including time records, and such records must be made  
5 readily available for inspection by the employee upon a reasonable request.

6 143. On December 23, 2025, PLAINTIFF caused a written request via certified mail to  
7 be delivered to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFF’S personnel and employment records, including  
8 but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; (4) time  
9 records; and (5) PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

10 144. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF their  
11 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty  
12 (30) days of their request stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this Complaint,  
13 DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.

14 145. PLAINTIFF is now entitled to and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance  
15 with California Labor Code Sections 226, 432, 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and  
16 applicable statutory penalties and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs for bringing this action.

17 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

21 146. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth  
22 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

23 147. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor  
24 laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's  
25 labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally  
26 a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The  
27 purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing"  
28 citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California

1 Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as  
2 private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." (Stats. 2003, ch.  
3 906, § 1.) Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

4 148. At all relevant times, for the reasons described herein and others, PLAINTIFF and  
5 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS within the  
6 meaning of Labor Code Section 2699(c).

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

10 150. PLAINTIFF complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code  
11 Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated March 26, 2026, PLAINTIFF  
12 gave written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to  
13 DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated,  
14 including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. (See Exhibit #1.)

15 151. As of the date of this complaint, more than sixty-five (65) days after serving the  
16 LWDA with notice of DEFENDANTS' violations, the LWDA has not provided any notice by  
17 certified mail of its intent to investigate the DEFENDANTS' alleged violations as mandated by  
18 Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(A). Accordingly, pursuant to Labor Code Section  
19 2699.3(a)(2)(A), PLAINTIFF may commence and is authorized to pursue this cause of action.

20 152. PLAINTIFFS, and such persons who may be added from time to time who satisfy  
21 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the PAGA, bring this  
22 Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to PLAINTIFF and all  
23 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California and classified  
24 as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of March 26,  
25 2025 through the present ("PAGA PERIOD").

26 153. PLAINTIFF is an "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE" within the meaning of Labor Code  
27 Section 2699(c) because PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS and personally suffered  
28 each of the alleged Labor Code violations committed by DEFENDANTS.

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

4           155. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), PLAINTIFF and the  
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANTS' violations of  
6 Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7,  
7 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802 and  
8 2804 in the following amounts:

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

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

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

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

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

28           f. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and 1199,

1 a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each  
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two  
3 hundred dollars fifty (\$250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay  
4 period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 1197.1].

5 156. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically  
6 provided, Labor Code Section 2699(f) imposes upon DEFENDANTS a penalty of up to two  
7 hundred dollars (\$200) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period. PLAINTIFF and the  
8 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs in  
9 connection with their claims for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(k)(1).

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for a judgment against all DEFENDANTS, jointly and  
12 severally, as follows:

13 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 14 a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA  
15 CLASS as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382;  
16 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining  
17 DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;  
18 c. An order requiring DEFENDANTS to pay all overtime wages and all sums  
19 unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members  
20 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and  
21 d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANTS' ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund  
22 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANTS' violations due to  
23 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

24 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 25 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth  
26 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant  
27 to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382;  
28 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory

1 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of  
2 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest  
3 thereon at the statutory rate;

4 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to California Labor Code Sections  
5 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;

6 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in  
7 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the  
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding  
9 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for  
10 violation of California Labor Code Section 226;

11 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a  
12 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action  
13 therefor is commenced, in accordance with California Labor Code Section 203.

14 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA  
15 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.

16 3. On the Ninth Cause of Action

17 a. For an award of statutory damages as pled pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226 and  
18 1198.5.

19 b. For an injunction compelling production of PLAINTIFF'S employment records  
20 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226, 432 and 1198.5 and the applicable IWC Wage  
21 Order.

22 4. On the Tenth Cause of Action:

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

25 b. For civil penalties to the extent permitted by law pursuant to the Labor Code under  
26 the Private Attorneys General Act; and

27 b. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

28 ///

1           5. On all claims:

- 2           a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 3           b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- 4           c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
- 5                 including and pursuant to, but not limited to, California Labor Code Sections 218.5,
- 6                 226, 246 and/or 1194.

7

8 DATED: September 3, 2026

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

9 By:   
10 Shani Zakay, Esq.  
11 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 ///

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

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

PLAINTIFF demands a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

DATED: September 3, 2026

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

By:   
Shani Zakay, Esq.  
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

# **EXHIBIT 1**



ZAKAY LAW GROUP  
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

**March 26, 2026**

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

**WESTCOAST CHILDREN'S CLINIC**

c/o Stacey Katz  
3301 E 12th Street, #259  
Oakland, CA 94601

***Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 3646 5441 95***

**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, 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 BRANDON GRAYS ("Plaintiff") and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant WESTCOAST CHILDREN'S CLINIC ("Defendants") in California from September of 2023 to October of 2025 and worked as a relief youth counselor at Defendants' office at 3301 E 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 259, Oakland, CA 94601. 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, 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 Defendants 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 Defendants 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 31, 2025 to September 13, 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.

|     |        |        |       |            |     |
|-----|--------|--------|-------|------------|-----|
| CO. | FILE   | DEPT.  | CLOCK | VCHR. NO.  | 075 |
| TT2 | 200526 | STAT00 |       | 0000384144 | 1   |

WESTCOAST CHILDREN'S CLINIC  
3301 E 12TH STREET, SUITE 259  
OAKLAND, CA 94601

## Earnings Statement



Period Beginning: 08/31/2025  
Period Ending: 09/13/2025  
Pay Date: 09/19/2025

Filing Status: Single/Married filing separately  
Exemptions/Allowances:  
Federal: Standard Withholding Table

BRANDON GRAYS

| Earnings         | rate    | hours | this period     |
|------------------|---------|-------|-----------------|
| Regular          | 23.0000 | 6.00  | 138.00          |
| REG SHIFT 2      | 25.4000 | 11.48 | 291.59          |
| HolidayDT2       |         |       |                 |
| MissedMealBrk    |         |       |                 |
| Paid SL          |         |       |                 |
| Phone            |         |       |                 |
| <b>Gross Pay</b> |         |       | <b>\$429.59</b> |

| year to date |
|--------------|
| 1,459.58     |
| 1,737.86     |
| 323.60       |
| 23.00        |
| 276.00       |
| 90.00        |
| 3,918.80     |

| Other Benefits and Information | this period | total to date |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Totl Hrs Worked                | 17.48       |               |

### Important Notes

COMPANY PH#: 510-269-9030

BASIS OF PAY: HOURLY

**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 and home internet. Specifically, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were required to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell phones and home internet in order to perform work related tasks. However, Defendants unlawfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones and home internet. 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 and home internet, all on behalf of and for the benefit of Defendants. For example, during the pay period of August 21, 2025 to September 13, 2025, Defendants required Plaintiff to use Plaintiff's personal cell phones and home internet. However, as evidenced by the example below, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff for the use of Plaintiff's personal cell phones and home internet.

|     |        |        |       |            |     |
|-----|--------|--------|-------|------------|-----|
| CO. | FILE   | DEPT.  | CLOCK | VCHR. NO.  | 075 |
| TT2 | 200526 | STAT00 |       | 0000384144 | 1   |

WESTCOAST CHILDREN'S CLINIC  
3301 E 12TH STREET, SUITE 259  
OAKLAND, CA 94601

## Earnings Statement



Period Beginning: 08/31/2025  
Period Ending: 09/13/2025  
Pay Date: 09/19/2025

Filing Status: Single/Married filing separately  
Exemptions/Allowances:  
Federal: Standard Withholding Table

BRANDON GRAYS

| Earnings         | rate    | hours | this period     |
|------------------|---------|-------|-----------------|
| Regular          | 23.0000 | 6.00  | 138.00          |
| REG SHIFT 2      | 25.4000 | 11.48 | 291.59          |
| HolidayDT2       |         |       |                 |
| MissedMealBrk    |         |       |                 |
| Paid SL          |         |       |                 |
| Phone            |         |       |                 |
| <b>Gross Pay</b> |         |       | <b>\$429.59</b> |

| year to date |
|--------------|
| 1,459.58     |
| 1,737.86     |
| 323.60       |
| 23.00        |
| 276.00       |
| 90.00        |
| 3,918.80     |

| Other Benefits and Information | this period | total to date |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Totl Hrs Worked                | 17.48       |               |

### Important Notes

COMPANY PH#: 510-269-9030

BASIS OF PAY: HOURLY

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.

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 and performing preparation work prior to the start of scheduled shifts. 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.

**Personnel File Violations:** On December 23, 2025, Plaintiff caused a written request 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 request 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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Shani O. Zakay', with a stylized flourish at the end.

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APC

Shani O. Zakay, Esq.