### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS WESTERN DIVISION

EASTERN DISTRICT ARCHARANS

OOT 2% 2017

MES W. MCCORMACK, CLERK

JAMES W. MCCORMACK, By:

CHANTAVIA CAMACHO and JOSEPH WALKER, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

VS.

No. 4:17-cv-704 - Suxw

STATE OF ARKANSAS
ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
a/k/a JONESBORO HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CENTER
CONWAY HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CENTER

**DEFENDANT** 

This case assigned to District Judge

and to Magistrate Judge.

## ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

COME NOW Plaintiffs Chantavia Camacho and Joseph Walker, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through their attorneys Chris Burks and Josh Sanford of Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and for their Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action against Defendant State of Arkansas -- Arkansas Department of Human Services a/k/a Jonesboro Human Development Center and Conway Human Development Center and ("Defendants"), they do hereby state and allege as follows:

#### I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

- 1. This is an action brought by Plaintiffs Chantavia Camacho and Joseph Walker, individually and on behalf of other hourly workers employed by Defendants at any time within a three-year period preceding the filing of this Complaint.
- 2. Hereafter, for convenience, both Plaintiffs will be collectively referred to as simply "Plaintiff" unless the shorthand would lead to confusion.

Page 1 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

3. Plaintiff brings this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §

201, et seq. ("FLSA") and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-

201, et seq. ("AMWA"), for declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated

damages, prejudgment interest, costs, including a reasonable attorney's fee as a result

of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and other hourly workers lawful overtime

compensation for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

4. Upon information and belief, for at least three (3) years prior to the filing of

this Complaint, Defendants have willfully and intentionally committed violations of the

FLSA as described, infra.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas has

subject matter jurisdiction over this suit under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1331

because this suit raises federal questions under the FLSA.

6. Plaintiff's claims under the AMWA form part of the same case or

controversy and arise out of the same facts as the FLSA claims alleged in this

complaint.

7. Therefore, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's AMWA

claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

8. The acts complained of herein were committed and had their principal

effect against Plaintiff within the Jonesboro and Western Divisions of the Eastern

District of Arkansas; therefore, venue is proper within this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§ 1391.

9. Defendants do business in this district and a substantial part of the events

alleged herein occurred in this District.

10. The witnesses to overtime violations alleged in this Complaint reside in

this District.

11. The payroll records and other documents related to the payroll practices

that Plaintiff challenges are located in this District.

III. THE PARTIES

12. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

13. Plaintiff Chantavia Camacho is a citizen and resident of Craighead

County.

14. Plaintiff Joseph Walker is a citizen and resident of Faulkner County.

15. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a resident care assistant within the

three (3) years preceding the filing of this Complaint.

16. Plaintiff was paid an hourly rate.

17. At all times material herein, Plaintiff has been entitled to the rights,

protections and benefits provided under the FLSA and the AMWA.

18. As an employee of Defendants, Plaintiff was an employee of a public state

agency employed in human development activities, and therefore entitled to the

protections of the FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(2)(c).

19. At all times material herein, Plaintiff has been misclassified by Defendants

as exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and the AMWA.

Page 3 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

20. Defendants are "employers" within the meanings set forth in the FLSA and

AMWA, and were, at all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, Plaintiff's

employer.

21. Defendants are employers subject to the FLSA as public agencies

pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203.

22. Defendants participated in the management of Plaintiff's work, including

setting and enforcing the amount of hours worked and the amount and manner of

compensation paid.

23. Defendants dictated, controlled and ratified, both implicitly and explicitly,

the wage and hour practices and all related employee compensation policies that are at

issue in this case.

24. Defendant Jonesboro Human Development Center ("JHDC") is one of

Arkansas's five Arkansas state-managed training facilities for people with

developmental disabilities where Plaintiff Camacho was employed within the three (3)

years prior to the filing of this Complaint as a residential care assistant.

25. Defendant Conway Human Development Center ("CHDC") is one of

Arkansas's five Arkansas State-managed training facilities for people with

developmental disabilities where Plaintiff Walker was employed within the three (3)

years prior to the filing of this Complaint as a residential care assistant.

26. JHDC can be served through its Administrator Forrest Steele, 4701

Colony Drive, Jonesboro, Arkansas 72401.

27. CHDC can be served through its Administrator Sarah Murphy, 150 East

Siebenmorgan Road, Conway, Arkansas 72032.

Page 4 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

28. Defendant State of Arkansas -- Arkansas Department of Human Services

("DHS") is the government entity or branch that operates and manages Defendants

JHDC and CHDC and the three other human development centers.

29. Defendant DHS can be served through its Director Cindy Gillespie.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

30. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

31. Plaintiff Camacho was an hourly-paid employee of JHDC and DHS at their

facility located in Jonesboro.

32. Plaintiff Walker was an hourly-paid employee of CHDC and DHS at their

facility located in Conway.

33. Plaintiff Camacho worked for Defendants during 2017 as a resident care

assistant.

34. Plaintiff Walker worked for Defendants from approximately April of 2017 to

September of 2017 as a resident care assistant.

35. Defendants hired Plaintiff and other similarly-situated employees, paid

them wages and benefits, controlled their work schedules, duties, protocols,

applications, assignments and employment conditions, and kept at least some records

regarding their employment.

36. Plaintiff and other similarly-situated employees were classified as hourly

employees and regularly worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

37. Plaintiff and other similarly-situated hourly employees record their time by

calling Defendants' timekeeper when they arrived for their shift.

Page 5 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

38. Plaintiff was required to clock-in each day at a specified time and to clock-

out when his shift ended, as well as for each break taken during the workday.

39. Plaintiff and other hourly employees often worked up to three (3) hours per

week for which they were not compensated.

40. It was Defendants' common policy to dock Plaintiff and other similarly-

situated hourly employees for fifteen (15) minutes of time if they arrived more than five

minutes late for their shift but were still within the first fifteen (15) minutes of their shift.

41. If Plaintiff and other similarly-situated hourly employees arrived more than

fifteen (15) minutes after their scheduled start time but were still within the first thirty

(30) minutes of their shift, they would be docked for thirty (30) minutes, regardless of

what time they arrived. This was also true if Plaintiff and other similarly-situated hourly

employees arrived between thirty (30) and forty-five (45) minutes late, and so on.

42. As a result of Defendants' improper rounding practice, Plaintiff and other

similarly-situated employees were not fully compensated for all the time they actually

worked in a workweek, including all of the overtime hours they worked in excess of forty

(40) in a workweek.

43. On information and belief, the rounding policy is in effect at all five state-

run human development centers.

44. Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way it

paid Plaintiff and other hourly employees violated the FLSA.

V. LEGAL ALLEGATIONS

44. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

Page 6 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_

A. <u>Individual Allegations under the FLSA</u>

45. 29 U.S.C. § 207 requires employers to pay employees one and one-half

times the employee's regular rate for all hours that the employee works in excess of

forty (40) per week. 29 U.S.C.S. § 207 (LEXIS 2013).

46. Defendants violated Section 778.208 of Title 29 of the Code of Federal

Regulations by failing to pay Plaintiff and other similarly-situated employees the proper

overtime premium.

47. Defendants' conduct and practice, as described above, have been and is

willful, intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

48. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendants are liable to

Plaintiff for, and Plaintiff seeks, unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages, pre-

judgment interest, civil penalties and costs, including reasonable attorney's fees as

provided by the FLSA.

B. FLSA § 216(b) Representative Action Allegations

49. Plaintiff brings this collective action on behalf of all hourly employees

employed by Defendants to recover monetary damages owed by Defendants to Plaintiff

and members of the Putative Class for all the overtime compensation for all the hours

he and they worked in excess of forty (40) each week.

50. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself individually and all other

similarly situated employees, former and present, who were and/or are affected by

Defendants' willful and intentional violation of the FLSA.

51. In the past three years, Defendants have employed hundreds of hourly

employees that were subject to Defendants' improper rounding scheme.

Page 7 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

52. Like Plaintiff, these hourly employees regularly worked more than 40

hours in a week.

53. Defendants failed to pay these employees the proper overtime wages.

Because these employees are similarly situated to Plaintiff, and because they are owed

overtime for the same reasons, the opt-in class is properly defined as:

All Hourly Workers Employed by Defendants Within the Past Three Years Who Ever Worked in Excess of Forty (40) Hours in any Week.

C. Individual Allegations Under the AMWA

54. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-203(4).

55. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiff's "employer" within the

meaning of the AMWA, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-203(4).

56. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed, as required

under the AMWA.

57. Defendants' conduct and practices, as described above, were willful,

intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

58. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendants are liable to

Plaintiff for monetary damages, liquidated damages, costs, and a reasonable attorney's

fee provided by the AMWA for all violations which occurred beginning at least three (3)

years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's initial complaint, plus periods of equitable tolling.

59. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendants acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiff as provided by the AMWA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of

prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

Page 8 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

D. Class Allegations Under the AMWA

60. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

61. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated who were

employed by Defendant within the State of Arkansas, brings this claim for relief for

violation of the AMWA as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure.

62. Plaintiff proposes to represent the first AMWA liability class of individuals

defined as follows:

All Hourly Workers Employed by Defendants in Arkansas Within the Past Three Years Who Ever Worked in Excess of Forty (40) Hours in any Week.

63. Upon information and belief, there are more than 100 persons in the

proposed class. Therefore, the proposed class is so numerous that joinder of all

members is impracticable.

64. Common questions of law and fact relate to all of the proposed liability

class members, such as these:

i. Whether Defendants' policy of failing to properly pay overtime-rate wages to members of the proposed class who worked in excess of

forty (40) hours per week was unlawful under the AMWA; and

ii. Whether, as a result of Defendants' failure to lawfully calculate Plaintiff's overtime pay, Defendants paid members of the proposed class one and one-half times their regular wages for hours worked

over forty (40) in each week in accordance with the AMWA.

65. The above common questions of law and fact predominate over any

questions affecting only Plaintiff, and a class action is superior to other available

methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.

Page 9 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_

66. The class members have no interest in individually controlling the

prosecution of separate actions because the policy of the AMWA provides a bright-line

rule for protecting all non-exempt employees as a class. To wit: "It is declared to be the

public policy of the State of Arkansas to establish minimum wages for workers in order

to safeguard their health, efficiency, and general well-being and to protect them as well

as their employers from the effects of serious and unfair competition resulting from

wage levels detrimental to their health, efficiency and well-being." Ark. Code Ann. § 11-

4-202. To that end, all non-exempted employees must be paid for time worked over

forty (40) hours per week at a rate of one and one-half times their regular rate. Ark.

Code Ann. § 11-4-211.

67. At the time of the filing of this Complaint, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's

counsel know of any litigation already begun by any members of the proposed class

concerning the allegations in this complaint.

68. No undue or extraordinary difficulties are likely to be encountered in the

management of this class action.

69. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed liability

class in that Plaintiff and all others in the proposed liability class will claim that they were

not paid one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of

forty per week.

70. Plaintiff and his counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interest of

the class.

71. Plaintiff's counsel is competent to litigate Rule 23 class actions and other

complex litigation matters, including wage and hour cases like this one.

Page 10 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

VI. EQUITABLE TOLLING

72. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

73. The applicable statute of limitations for Plaintiff's FLSA cause of action

should be tolled because strict application of the statute of limitations would be

inequitable.

74. Defendant, as employers with a duty to comply with the FLSA and the

means to do so, was and had at all relevant times been in a far superior position than

Plaintiff to understand the FLSA and apply it appropriately, and Defendants should not

be permitted to benefit from this imbalance of power by the passage of time.

VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Joseph Walker respectfully prays

as follows:

A. That each Defendant be summoned to appear and answer this Complaint;

B. For orders regarding certification of and notice to the proposed collective

and class action members;

C. A declaratory judgment that Defendants' practices alleged herein violate

the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., and attendant regulations at 29

C.F.R. § 516 et seq.;

D. A declaratory judgment that Defendants' practices alleged herein violate

the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. and the related

regulations;

Page 11 of 12
Chantavia Camacho, et al. v. State of Arkansas—Arkansas DHS, et al.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

E. Judgment for damages for all unpaid overtime wage compensation owed

to Plaintiff and the proposed class members under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29

U.S.C. § 201, et seq., and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. § 516 et seq.;

F. Judgment for damages for all unpaid overtime wage compensation under

the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. and the related

regulations;

G. Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards

Act, 29 US.C. § 201, et seq., and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. § 516 et seq., in an

amount equal to all unpaid overtime compensation owed to Plaintiff and the proposed

class members during the applicable statutory period;

H. Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the Arkansas Minimum

Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq., and the relating regulations;

I. For a reasonable attorneys' fee, costs, and pre-judgment interest; and

J. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem necessary, just and

proper.

Respectfully submitted,

CHANTAVIA CAMACHO and JOSEPH WALKER, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFFS

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC ONE FINANCIAL CENTER 650 SOUTH SHACKLEFORD, SUITE 411 LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72211 TELEPHONE: (501) 221-0088 FACSIMILE: (888) 787-2040

By:

Chris Burks

Ark. Bar No. 2010207 chris@sanfordlawfirm.com

and

Josh Sanford

Ark. Bar No. 2001037 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

## **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.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS  DEFENDANTS  DEFENDANTS  ONLY					
• •	and JOSEPH WALKER, Individually a	nd on HUMAN DEVELO	JONESBORO HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CENTER, CONWAY HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CENTER and ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES		
(b) County of Residence o			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant		
` '	(CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O	NLY)	
(12)	COLUMN CONTRACTOR CONT	NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE OF LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name	Address and Telenhone Number	Attorneys (If Known)			
Josh Sanford, SANFORD 650 South Shackleford, S 501-221-0088; josh@sar	Address, and Telephone Number)  LAW FIRM, PLLC, One Financial Cer Suite 411, Little Rock, Arkansas 72211  Ifordlawfirm.com	nter,			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	<b>Ճ</b> 3 Federal Question		TF DEF	PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and P of Business In A		
		Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.					
			T	· ·	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY   310 Airplane   365 Personal Injury	· ·	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Product Liabil		28 USC 157	3729(a))	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability 367 Health Care/		Marie a recommendation of the August Conference of	400 State Reapportionment	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical Slander Personal Injury		□ 820 Copyrights	☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers' Product Liabili		☐ 830 Patent	☐ 450 Commerce	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability 368 Asbestos Perso		☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated	460 Deportation	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine Injury Product ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	·	New Drug Application  840 Trademark	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment		ERTY SAME MODE AND ASSESSMENT	ERECTORIST CHARLES	☐ 480 Consumer Credit	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 370 Other Fraud	▼ 710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle ☐ 371 Truth in Lendi Product Liability ☐ 380 Other Personal		☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Property Dama		□ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury 385 Property Dame		☐ 865 RS1 (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts	
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Product Liabilit  Medical Malpractice	y 751 Family and Medical Leave Act		☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
STATE ROAL PROPERTY	EMECHANISTIC INCOMESSES DE L'ENVIRONMENT DE L'ENVIRONMENT DE L'ENVIRONMENT DE L'ENVIRONMENT DE L'ENVIRONMENT DE		STORY AND A STORY		
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights Habeas Corpus:	☐ 791 Employee Retirement	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	896 Arbitration	
220 Foreclosure	441 Voting 463 Alien Detained 442 Employment 510 Motions to Va		or Defendant)  871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of	
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	442 Employment 510 Modolis to Val	cate	26 USC 7609	Agency Decision	
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations		╛	☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 535 Death Penalty Employment Other:	462 Naturalization Application		State Statutes	
	Employment Other:  446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus &		"[		
	Other 550 Civil Rights	Actions			
	☐ 448 Education ☐ 555 Prison Conditi ☐ 560 Civil Detainee				
	Conditions of	·			
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)					
Toriginal Proceeding State Court State Court Appellate Court Appellate Court State Court S					
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite Jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 29 USC 201				
Brief description of cause: Unpaid Overtime violations					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		ON DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S)					
IF ANY	(See instructions):  JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD					
10/25/2017					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING II	FP JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE	

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Lawsuit: State of Arkansas, Dept. of Human Services Improperly Docked Hourly Pay</u>