UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
RASHA ALSAIDI, on behalf of herself, individually,	Case No.
and on behalf of all others similarly-situated, Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT
- against -	PLAINTIFF DEMANDS A TRIAL BY JURY
WELLLIFE NETWORK INC. f/k/a PSCH INC.,	22 22 22 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
Defendant.	

RASHA ALSAIDI, ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly-situated (collectively as "FLSA Plaintiffs"), by and through her attorneys, PHILLIPS & ASSOCIATES, PLLC, against WELLLIFE NETWORK INC., formerly known as PSCH INC., ("Defendant" or "Welllife") alleges upon knowledge as to herself and her own actions and upon information and belief as to all other matters as follows:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. This is a civil action based upon violations that Defendant committed of Plaintiff's rights guaranteed to her by: (i) the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 207(a); (ii) the overtime provisions of the New York Labor Law ("NYLL"), NYLL § 160; N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. ("NYCCRR") tit. 12, § 142-2.2; (iii) the NYLL's requirement that employers furnish employees with a wage notice at hire containing specific categories of accurate information, NYLL § 195(1); (iv) the NYLL's requirement that employers furnish employees with wage statements on each payday containing specific categories of accurate information, NYLL § 195(3); (v) the interference provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 ("FMLA"), 29 U.S.C. § 2601, et seq.; and (vi) any other claim(s) that can be inferred from the facts set forth herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as this action arises under, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. and 29 U.S.C. § 2601, et seq.
- The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over all state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 4. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2), as a substantial part of the actions or omissions giving rise to the claims for relief occurred within this judicial district.

PARTIES

- 5. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff worked for Defendant in New York, and was an "employee" entitled to protection as defined by the FLSA, NYLL, and NYCCRR.
- 6. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff was and is a resident of the State of New York and was an "employee" entitled to protection as defined by the FMLA.
- 7. At all relevant times herein, Defendant is a New York not-for-profit corporation with its principal place of business located at 142-02 20th Avenue, 3rd Floor, Flushing, New York 11351 that, prior to January 2017, was formerly known as "PSCH INC."
- 8. At all relevant times herein, Defendant was and is an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL, as it is an institution primarily engaged in the care of the mentally ill, many of whom reside on Defendant's premises. This independently subjects Defendant to the FLSA as an enterprise engaged in commerce pursuant to 29 U.S. Code § 203(r)(2)(A).
- 9. At all relevant times herein, Defendant "employs" fifty or more "employees," and is thus an "employer" within the meaning of the FMLA.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

10. Plaintiff seeks to bring this suit to recover from Defendant unpaid overtime compensation and liquidated damages pursuant to the applicable provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), individually, on her own behalf, as well as on behalf of those in the following collective:

Current and former employees of Defendant, who during the applicable FLSA limitations period, performed any work for Defendant as an intensive care coordinator/manager, and who consent to file a claim to recover damages for overtime compensation that is legally due to them ("FLSA Plaintiffs").

- 11. Defendant treated Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs similarly in that Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs: (1) performed similar tasks, as described in the "Material Facts" section below; (2) were subject to the same laws and regulations; (3) were paid in the same or similar manner; (4) were required to work in excess of forty hours in a workweek; and (5) were not paid the required one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked per workweek in excess of forty.
- 12. At all relevant times, Defendant is and has been aware of the requirements to pay Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs at an amount equal to the rate of one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked each workweek above forty, yet they purposefully and willfully chose and choose not to do so.
- 13. Thus, Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs are victims of Defendant's pervasive practice of willfully refusing to pay their employees overtime compensation for all hours worked per workweek above forty, in violation of the FLSA.

MATERIAL FACTS

14. At all relevant times herein, Defendant was and is a domestic non-for-profit corporation that employs and employed over fifty employees and provides health services, including

- residential services, to individuals coping with developmental and mental illness. According to Defendant's website: "WellLife Network offers comprehensive behavioral health services, including: psychiatric rehabilitation; case management; consumer self-help; family and peer support; and residential services."
- 15. Plaintiff commenced her employment with Defendant on April 18, 2016; therefore, Plaintiff worked for over twelve months, as an intensive care coordinator/manager. In this role, Plaintiff's job duties, included, but were not limited to, conducting intakes; monitoring clients' compliance with their treatments plans by recording their progress as reported by clients, conducting home visits, and responding to clients' calls and texts regarding issues that required immediate attention. Indeed, Defendant assigned Plaintiff a company cell phone and required her to respond to any calls and texts that arose after her regular weekday schedule ended.
- 16. Throughout Plaintiff's employment as an intensive care coordinator/manager, Plaintiff never directed the work of any employees. Moreover, Plaintiff did not have the authority to hire or fire any of Defendant's employees and her suggestions to hiring and firing decisions were not given any weight.
- 17. From April 18, 2016 until May 1, 2017, and then again from July 25, 2017 until July 31, 2017, Defendant required Plaintiff to work, and Plaintiff did work, five to six days a week, Monday through Friday, from 8:40 a.m. until 4:40 p.m., and from 6:00 p.m. until between 8:00 p.m. or 8:30 p.m. per day, without being permitted to take an uninterrupted break each day, and either Saturday or Sunday between forty-five minutes and one hour, totaling between fifty-one hours and forty-five minutes and 53.5 hours worked per week.
- 18. From August 1, 2017 until April 24, 2018, Plaintiff worked five to six days a week, from Tuesday until Saturday, from 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. and from 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

on Tuesday; from either 7:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. or 8:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. and from 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m. on Wednesday; from 9:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. and from 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday; and from either 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. or 9:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, without being permitted to take an uninterrupted break each day; and approximately twenty minutes either after 4:00 p.m. or 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or on Sunday, totaling forty-six hours and twenty minutes.

- 19. From the commencement of Plaintiff's employment until in or around December 2016, Defendant paid Plaintiff a bi-weekly salary in the amount of \$1,326.28, regardless of the hours that Plaintiff worked. This bi-weekly salary was intended to cover only the first forty hours that Plaintiff worked each week, which amounts to a regular rate of \$16.58 per hour. From in or around January 2017 until April 24, 2018, Defendant paid Plaintiff an hourly rate in the amount of \$19.23 for all regular hours worked up to forty and an overtime rate in the amount of \$28.85 for some hours worked over forty, but not all, and most of the time for none at all.
- 20. From the commencement of Plaintiff's employment until in or around December 2016, Defendant did not pay Plaintiff at any rate of pay for any hours that she worked in excess of forty. From in or around January 2017 until April 24, 2018, Defendant either only paid Plaintiff for her hours worked up to forty, and therefore, nothing for her hours worked in excess of forty, or paid Plaintiff time and one-half her regular rate for some of her hours worked over forty in a week and therefore, nothing for others in that same week.
- 21. By way of example, during the week of September 17 until September 23, 2017 and September 24 until September 30, 2017, Defendants required Plaintiff to work, and Plaintiff did work, the following schedule:

September 17 – September 23, 2017

Sunday: Off

Monday: Off

Tuesday: 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Wednesday: 7:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Thursday: 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Friday: 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Saturday: 9:00 until 5:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 7:50 p.m.

Accordingly, Plaintiff worked a total of 46 hours and twenty minutes for this workweek.

For his work during this workweek, Defendant paid Plaintiff at her straight-time rate of

\$19.23 for all hours that Plaintiff worked up to forty and her overtime rate of \$28.85 for

1.00 hour that she worked over forty. Defendant did not pay Plaintiff at any rate of pay for

the remaining five hours and twenty minutes that she worked over forty.

September 24 – September 30, 2017

Sunday: Off

Monday: Off

Tuesday: 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Wednesday: 7:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Thursday: 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Friday: 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Saturday: 9:00 until 5:00 p.m.; and 7:30 p.m. until 7:50 p.m.

Accordingly, Plaintiff worked a total of 46 hours and twenty minutes for this workweek.

For her work during this workweek, Defendant paid Plaintiff at her straight-time rate of

\$19.23 for all hours that Plaintiff worked up to forty and her overtime rate of \$28.85 for

.50 hours that she worked over forty. Defendant did not pay Plaintiff at any rate of pay for

6

- the remaining 5.90 hours that she worked over forty.
- 22. Defendant paid Plaintiff on a bi-weekly basis.
- 23. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with any wage notice at the time of her hire, let alone one that accurately contained, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's regular and overtime rates of pay.
- 24. On each occasion when Defendant paid Plaintiff, Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with a wage statement that accurately listed, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's regularly hourly rates of pay, her overtime rates of pay, and/or the number of regular and overtime hours that she worked per week.
- 25. Defendant treated Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs in the same manner described herein.
- 26. Defendant acted in this manner to maximize its profits and minimize its labor costs and overhead.
- 27. Each hour that Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs worked was for Defendant's benefit.

Plaintiff's FMLA claims

- 28. Plaintiff was on an FMLA leave of absence from May 1, 2017 until July 24, 2017 due to Plaintiff's pregnancy. Plaintiff returned to work on July 25, 2017.
- 29. On April 19, 2018, as Plaintiff was leaving the office to conduct a home visit, she slipped and fell on her back due to a wet floor in Defendant's hallway. Despite this fall, Plaintiff continued working that day.
- 30. On April 20, 2018, Plaintiff went to work and spoke with Dominique Bristol, Plaintiff's supervisor, to inform her about the slip and fall and the extreme pain that Plaintiff was feeling. Exasperated, Ms. Bristol told Plaintiff: "Well now I have to do an incident report."
- 31. On April 23, 2018, Plaintiff e-mailed Ms. Bristol a letter from Plaintiff's doctor, stating that she had to stay away from work until April 26, 2018 due to Plaintiff's bulge and herniated disc ("First Doctor's Note"). Ms. Bristol did not respond to Plaintiff's request

- for leave due to her serious medical condition either via e-mail or phone call.
- 32. On April 24, 2018, despite Plaintiff's First Doctor's Note, Ms. Bristol asked Plaintiff to work from home. In fear of losing her job, Plaintiff worked from home per Ms. Bristol's demand.
- 33. On April 25, 2018, Brittney Herbert, Defendant's Human Resources representative, e-mailed Plaintiff a letter, dated April 24, 2018 ("April 24, 2018 FMLA letter"), stating the following:

This will confirm your Workers Compensation Leave of Absence, which commenced on April 24, 2018. You took an FMLA leave for birth of a child May 1, 2017 and returned July 24, 2017. You have exhausted your FMLA allowance during the 12 month period preceding your currently requested leave. Employees are eligible if they have worked for their employer for at least one year and for 1,250 hours over the previous 12 months.

You have not met the requirements for FMLA leave however;[sic] you may be eligible for a personal leave of absence. The Company's policy regarding personal leave provides that PSCH may grant a leave of absence without pay for "compelling personal reasons" for a period of time not to exceed one (1) month.

Unfortunately, in order to provide continuing services to our clients, it may be necessary to fill your position as Intensive Case Manager at the MH BLD Queens location. (emphasis added)

In the above-referenced letter, Defendant failed to explain to Plaintiff its method of computing Plaintiff's annual eligibility under the FMLA. In that same e-mail, Ms. Herbert also attached a letter, dated April 24, 2018, ("April 24, 2018 ADA letter") which stated the following:

As you know you are not eligible for FMLA leave but you may be eligible for a personal leave. The Company's policy regarding personal leave provides that Well Life Network may grant a leave of absence without pay for "compelling personal reasons" for a period of time not to exceed one (1)

month

In order to consider your request for leave or other accommodation, we will need to receive additional information from you and your treating health care provider

Please send the attached letter to your treating health care provider asking him or her to respond fully to our questions and ensure that they are returned to me no later than the close of business on **May 9, 2018**.

- That same day, on April 25, 2018, which was before Defendant's May 9, 2018 deadline, Plaintiff's doctor faxed the requested documents to Defendant's office. Plaintiff also emailed Ms. Bristol and Ms. Herbert a second doctor's note stating that Plaintiff had to stay away from work until May 10, 2018 ("Second Doctor's Note") due to Plaintiff's bulge and herniated disc. Later that day, Plaintiff called Ms. Bristol to let her know that Ms. Herbert told her to stop working from home because of, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's Second Doctor's Note. In response, Ms. Bristol told Plaintiff that she was going to speak with Taryn Clarke, the Program Director, and "get back to [Plaintiff]" because "we have a lot of work and it needs to get done!" Ms. Bristol never got back to Plaintiff.
- 35. On May 10, 2018, Plaintiff e-mailed Ms. Herbert her third doctor's note recommending that Plaintiff stay out of work from May 8, 2018 until July 1, 2018 due to Plaintiff's bulge and herniated disc ("Third Doctor's Note").
- 36. On May 23, 2018, Ms. Herbert e-mailed Plaintiff to request that her medical provider complete the original documents, which were attached Ms. Herbert's April 24, 2018 ADA letter, as Ms. Herbert claimed that Defendant never received said documents by Defendant's May 9, 2018 deadline.
- 37. On May 24, 2018, Plaintiff informed Ms. Herbert, and also sent her a copy with a date stamp via e-mail, that Plaintiff's doctor faxed the requested documents on April 25, 2018.

That same day, Ms. Herbert e-mailed Plaintiff a letter, dated May 24, 2018, ("May 24, 2018 letter") stating the following:

Your ADA/Personal Leave of Absence has been approved through May 20th, 2018 and we expect you to return on **May 21th**, **2018**.

Please be advised that you must contact your supervisor prior to your return. If you are unable to return on your expected return date, your employment may be terminated, and you will have to re-apply for any position for which you qualify.

This was the first time Defendant ever notified Plaintiff that it expected her to return on May 21, 2018. Immediately after receiving the May 24, 2018 letter, Plaintiff called Ms. Herbert to clarify the return date, as the letter designated May 21, 2018 as Plaintiff's return date, which had already passed. Ms. Herbert merely said that May 21, 2018 was the day Defendant wanted Plaintiff to return. Plaintiff requested that Defendant change the return date from May 21 to July 1, 2018 to coincide with Plaintiff's Third Doctor's Note. Ms. Herbert told Plaintiff that she was going to speak with Ms. Clarke and get back to her.

38. On June 13, 2018, without explaining the reestablishment of Plaintiff's eligibility under the FMLA, Ms. Herbert called Plaintiff to let her know that Defendant terminated her employment effective immediately because Plaintiff was unable to return on May 21, 2018 as directed by Defendant's May 24, 2018 letter. That same day, Ms. Herbert e-mailed Plaintiff a termination letter stating the following:

On April 24, 2018 you were notified that you <u>have not</u> met the requirements to qualify for the Family Medical Leave Act. Employees are eligible if they have worked for their employer for at least one year and for 1,250 hours over the previous 12 months. You were provided with a letter outlining the company's willingness to provide reasonable accommodation under ADA for a personal leave of absence not to exceed a month. On May 8, 2018 we received medical documentation from your Health Care Provider stating that you will need to remain out of work until July 1, 2018. Unfortunately, due to operation needs of the department we are unable to grant you request

for additional leave. Your position has been terminated effective 6/13/18.

39. Defendant's actions and conduct were intentional and intended to harm Plaintiff.

- 40. At all relevant times herein, Defendant was and has been aware of the requirements under the FMLA, but it purposefully and willfully chose to interfere with Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA.
- 41. As a result of Defendant's interference with Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA, she has suffered and will continue to suffer pecuniary loss.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT

Unpaid Overtime in Violation of the FLSA

- 42. Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs repeat, reiterate, and re-allege each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- 43. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) requires employers to compensate their employees at a rate of not less than one and one-half times their regular rates of pay for all hours worked exceeding forty in a workweek.
- 44. As described above, Defendant is an employer within the meaning of the FLSA while Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs are employees within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 45. As also described above, Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs worked in excess of forty hours per week, yet Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs in accordance with the FLSA's overtime provisions.
- 46. Defendant willfully violated the FLSA.
- 47. Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs are entitled to overtime pay for all hours worked per week in excess of forty at the rate of one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay.
- 48. Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs are also entitled to liquated damages, attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements in this action for Defendant's violations of the FLSA's overtime

provisions.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT

<u>Unpaid Overtime in Violation of the NYLL and NYCCRR</u>

- 49. Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, repeat, reiterate, and re-allege each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.
- 50. NYLL § 160 and 12 NYCCRR § 142-2.2 require employers to compensate their employees at a rate not less than one and one-half times their regular rates of pay for all hours worked exceeding forty in a workweek.
- As described above, Defendant is an employer within the meaning of the NYLL and the NYCCRR, while Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, are employees within the meaning of the NYLL and the NYCCRR.
- 52. As also described above, Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, worked in excess of forty hours in a workweek, yet Defendant failed to compensate them in accordance with the NYLL's and the NYCCRR's overtime provisions.
- Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, are entitled to their overtime pay for all hours worked per week in excess of forty at the rate of one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay.
- 54. Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, are also entitled to liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements in this action for Defendant's violations of the NYLL's and NYCCRR's overtime provisions.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT Failure to Furnish Proper Wage Notice in Violation of the NYLL

55. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.

- 56. NYLL § 195(1) requires that employers provide employees with a wage notice at the time of hire containing accurate, specifically enumerated criteria.
- 57. As described above, Defendant failed to furnish Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who optsin to this action, with any wage notice at hire, let alone one accurately containing all of the criteria required under the NYLL.
- 58. Prior to February 27, 2015, pursuant to NYLL § 198(1-b), Defendant is liable to Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, in the amount of \$50 for each workweek after the violation occurred, up to a statutory cap of \$2,500.
- 59. On or after February 27, 2015, pursuant to NYLL § 198(1-b), Defendant is liable to Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, in the amount of \$50 for each day after the violation occurred, up to the statutory cap of \$5,000.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT Failure to Furnish Proper Wage Statements in Violation of the NYLL

- 60. Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, repeat, reiterate, and re-allege each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.
- 61. NYLL § 195(3) requires that employers furnish employees with wage statements containing accurate, specifically enumerated criteria on each occasion when the employer pays wages to the employees.
- 62. As described above, Defendant failed to furnish Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who optsin to this action, with accurate wage statements on each payday containing the criteria required by the NYLL.
- 63. Prior to February 27, 2015, pursuant to NYLL § 198(1-d), Defendant is liable to Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, in the amount of \$100 for each

- workweek after the violation occurred, up to a statutory cap of \$2,500.
- 64. On or after February 27, 2015, pursuant to NYLL § 198(1-d), Defendant is liable to Plaintiff, and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action, in the amount of \$250 for each workday after the violation occurred, up to a statutory cap of \$5,000.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT *Interference with Plaintiff's Rights in Violation of the FMLA*

- 65. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.
- 66. The FMLA prohibits an employer from interfering with, restraining, or denying the exercise of, or the attempt to exercise, any right guaranteed under the FMLA.
- 67. As described above, Plaintiff is an eligible employee under the FMLA and Defendant is an employer, as defined by the FMLA.
- 68. Under the FMLA, Plaintiff was entitled to medically necessary leave as a result of her serious health condition.
- 69. Defendant interfered with Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA by, *inter alia*, misinforming Plaintiff that she was not eligible to take FMLA leave.
- 70. Defendant willfully violated the FMLA.
- 71. As a result of Defendant's unlawful discriminatory conduct in violation of the FMLA, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, economic loss, for which she is entitled to an award of monetary damages, interest, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the sum of lost wages and benefits, plus interest.

JURY DEMAND

72. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff, as to Defendant's violation of the FMLA, and Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs, as to Defendant's violation of the FLSA,

NYLL, and NYCCRR, demand a trial by jury on all claims in this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, as to Defendant's violation of the FMLA, and Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs, as to Defendant's violation of the FLSA, NYLL, and NYCCRR, respectfully request a judgment against the Defendant:

- A. Declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and in willful violation of the aforementioned United States and New York State laws;
- B. Declaring that Defendant engaged in unlawful employment practices prohibited by the FMLA, in that Defendant interfered with Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA.
- C. Declaring preliminary and permanent injunctions against Defendant and its officers, owners, agents, successors, employees, representatives, and any and all persons acting in concert with them, from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, customs, and usages set forth herein;
- D. Designating this action as an FLSA collective action on behalf of Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs and prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and tolling of the statute of limitations;
- E. Designating Plaintiff and her counsel as collective action representatives under the FLSA;
- F. Awarding all damages that Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs have sustained as a result of Defendant's conduct, including all unpaid wages and any short fall between wages paid and those due under the law that Plaintiff would have received but for Defendant's unlawful payment practices;
- G. Awarding liquidated damages and any other statutory penalties as recoverable under the FLSA, the NYLL, and the FMLA and as consistent with law;
- H. Awarding damages to Plaintiff for all lost wages and benefits resulting from Defendant's

unlawful discrimination, and to otherwise make her whole for any losses suffered as a result

of such unlawful employment practices;

Awarding Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs their costs and disbursements incurred in I.

connection with this action, including reasonable attorneys' fees, expert witness fees and

other costs, and a service payment to Plaintiff;

J. Awarding pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as provided by law; and

K. Awarding Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court may deem

equitable, just, and proper.

Dated: New York, New York

September 26, 2018

PHILLIPS & ASSOCIATES, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, PLLC

Joan B. Lopez, Esq. Marjorie Mesidor, Esq.

45 Broadway, Suite 620

New York, New York 10006

T: (212) 248 - 7431

F: (212) 901 – 2107

jlopez@tpglaws.com mmesidor@tpglaws.com

JS 44 (Rev. 11/15)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM)

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	OF THIS FO	DRM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS RASHA ALSAIDI, on behalf of herself, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly-situated,				DEFENDANTS WELLLIFE NETW	ORK INC.	f/k/a PSCH IN	C.,		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Westchester (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			100	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Phillips & Associates, PL 45 Broadway, Suite 620, Tel: (212) 248-7431	.LC			Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in t	One Box j	for Plaintif
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government)	lot a Party)			IF DEF	Incorporated or Pri		or Defende PTF □ 4	DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A	A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY	J 5	□ 5
	III III AAAAAA III II II II II II II II			en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	D 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			F(DEFITIBE/PENALTY	I RAN	KRHPTCV	OTHER	STATUT	TS
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability PRESONAL PROPEN 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 550 Civil Rights 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Y	CABOR Other LABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Hamily and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe 423 With 28 U PROPEI 820 Copp 830 Pater 840 Trade 861 HIA 862 Black 863 DIW 864 SSID 865 RSI (FEDER. 870 Taxe or D 871 IRS—26 U	RTY RIGHTS rrights tt emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI (405(g)) AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	480 Consum 490 Cable/S 850 Securiti Exchan 890 Other Si 891 Agricult 893 Environ 895 Freedon Act 896 Arbitrat 899 Adminis Act/Rev	laims Act in (31 USC)) capportion is ind Bankin ree ition Organizat er Credit at TV es/Commo ge tatutory A tural Acts imental M in of Infori ion strative Pr iew or Ap Decision itionality	nament ang accid and tions odities/ actions fatters mation
	moved from a 3 Cite the U.S. Civil State 29 U.S.C. § 207(a	Appellate Court tute under which you a a) use:			r District	☐ 6 Multidistr. Litigation			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	<u> </u>	IS A CLASS ACTION	N D	EMAND S		THECK YES only URY DEMAND:		complai	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER			
DATE 09/26/2018	THE NOTE THE PARTY OF THE PARTY	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY (DF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			M			Ullima A.			
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	OGE		

Case 1:18-cv-05404 Document 1-1 Filed 09/26/18 Page 2 of 2 PageID #: 18 CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY Local Arbitration Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed. Case is Eligible for Arbitration I. Joan B. Lopez, Esq. counsel for , do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s) monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, the complaint seeks injunctive relief. the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1 Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more or its stocks: RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form) Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50,3,1 in Section VIII on the front of this form, Rule 50,3,1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that " A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court." NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2) 1.) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes No 2.) If you answered "no" above: a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk Yes No b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes No c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, specify the County in which the offending communication was received: If your answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County?

Yes

No (Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts). BAR ADMISSION I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. $\sqrt{}$ Yes No Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature:

(If yes, please explain

No

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

Eastern District of New York					
RASHA ALSAIDI, on behalf of herself, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly-situated,)))				
Plaintiff(s)	,)				
V.	Civil Action No.				
WELLLIFE NETWORK INC. f/k/a PSCH INC.,)				
WELLEN E WETWORK INO. INVAT SOFTING.,)))				
Defendant(s))				
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION				
To: (Defendant's name and address) WELLLIFE NETWOK INC. Via Registered Agent C/O DIANNE M. CAMELO, LEVY, STOPOL & CAMELO 1425 RXR PLAZA UNIONDALE, NEW YORK,	ESQ. O, LLP				
A lawsuit has been filed against you.					
are the United States or a United States agency, or an office					
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.					
	CLERK OF COURT				
Date:					
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk				

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

was re	This summons for (n ceived by me on (date)	ame of individual and title, if an						
	☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the indi						
			on (date)	; or				
	☐ I left the summon							
			a person of suitable age and discretion wh		ere,			
	on (date)	on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or						
	\square I served the summons on (name of individual)							
	designated by law to	o accept service of process	on behalf of (name of organization)					
		; or						
	☐ I returned the sun	returned the summons unexecuted because						
	☐ Other (specify):							
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total	of\$).00			
	I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.							
Date:		·						
			Server's signature					
		_	Printed name and title					
		_	Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Lawsuit Alleging Wage and Hour, FMLA Violations Filed Against WellLife Network</u>