1 Of 1 FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

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

JAMES W. MCCORMACK, CLERK
By:

DEP CLERK

RICHARD CHUNN, Individually and on Behalf of Others Similarly Situated

**PLAINTIFF** 

VS.

No. 4:17-cv- 107-Sww

#### UNITED STATES BEEF CORPORATION

**DEFENDANT** 

## ORIGINAL COMPLAINT— CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

COMES NOW Plaintiff Richard Chunn ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys Joshua West and Josh Sanford of the Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and for his Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action, against Defendant United States Beef Corporation ("Defendant"), and they do hereby state and allege as follows:

This case assigned to District Judge This case and to Magistrate Judge

#### I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

1. The purpose of this Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action (hereinafter "Complaint") is to make allegations of violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq., on behalf of Plaintiff Richard Chunn and the classes he seeks to represent regarding unpaid overtime wages.

### II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. ("FLSA"), and

Page 1 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

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

declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest,

civil penalties and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees as a result of Defendant's

failure to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated overtime compensation for all

hours that Plaintiff and all others similarly situated worked in excess of forty (40) per

workweek as required by the FLSA and AMWA.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's AMWA claims

pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

6. Defendant conducts business within the State of Arkansas, operating

several fast food eating establishments.

7. Venue lies properly within this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and

(c)(2), because the State of Arkansas has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and

Defendant therefore "resides" in Arkansas.

8. Defendant employed Plaintiff at a restaurant located in the Eastern District

of Arkansas.

Page 2 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

9. The acts alleged in this Complaint had their principal effect within the Eastern District of Arkansas, and venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

1391.

III. THE PARTIES

10. Plaintiff is an individual and a resident and domiciliary of the State of

Arkansas.

11. Defendant is a foreign for-profit corporation whose registered agent for

service of process for the State of Arkansas is INCORP SERVICES, INC., 4250

VENETIAN LANE, FAYETTEVILLE, ARKANSAS 72703.

12. Defendant is a fast food eatery company headquartered in Tulsa,

Oklahoma.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

14. Defendant has at least two employees that handle, sell, or otherwise work

with goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce.

15. Defendant's annual gross volume of sales or business done for each of

the three years preceding the filing of the Original Complaint is not less than

\$500,000.00.

16. Defendant has maintained more than four employees within the State of

Arkansas at all times after three years preceding the Original Complaint.

Page 3 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

17. Defendant is Arby's largest franchisee with over 350 restaurants in nine

contiguous states, including Oklahoma, Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Colorado,

Idaho, Wyoming, and Washington.

18. Defendant employed Plaintiff at an Arby's in Little Rock within the three

years prior to the filing of this lawsuit.

19. At all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, Defendant

employed Plaintiff as an assistant manager in at least one of Defendant's eateries in

Little Rock.

20. Defendant is an "employer" within the meanings set forth in the FLSA and

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

employer.

21. During the period relevant to this lawsuit, Defendant classified Plaintiff as

an hourly employee, non-exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and the

AMWA.

22. Plaintiff worked more than forty hours per week in one or more weeks

within the three years prior to the filing of Plaintiff's Original Complaint.

23. While Defendant employed Plaintiff as an assistant manager, Plaintiff was

eligible for, and participated in, Defendant's incentive plan, through which Defendant

paid Plaintiff non-discretionary monetary bonuses.

24. The bonuses Defendant paid to its hourly employees were either fixed

amounts or percentages and were based on the employee's performance and ability to

meet certain criteria set by Defendant.

Page 4 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

25. During part of the time period relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff worked

as an hourly-paid assistant manager and received non-discretionary bonuses.

26. Defendant did not include Plaintiff's bonuses when calculating his regular

rates for overtime pay purposes.

27. Plaintiff worked more than forty hours in at least one week during the time

period relevant to this Complaint in which he also received a bonus, and his bonus was

not included in the calculation of his overtime pay rate.

28. Other hourly-paid employees also worked more than forty hours in at least

one week during the time period relevant to this Complaint in which they also received a

bonus, and their bonuses were not included in the calculation of their overtime pay rate.

29. Defendant violated the FLSA and AMWA by not including the bonus of

Plaintiff into his regular rate when calculating his overtime pay.

V. FLSA § 216(b) COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

31. Plaintiff bring his claims for relief for violation of the FLSA as a collective

action pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

32. At all relevant times, Defendant maintained one corporate office or

department responsible for developing or implementing Defendant's pay policies for all

of its Arby's stores.

33. All assistant managers who worked for Defendant's Arby's stores were

paid an hourly rate and were eligible for Defendant's incentive plan.

Page 5 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

34. At least some assistant managers, other than Plaintiff, who worked for

Defendant's Arby's stores were paid an hourly rate and were eligible for Defendant's

incentive plan.

35. At least some assistant managers, other than Plaintiff, worked more than

forty hours per week during weeks in which they earned a bonus.

36. Defendant did not include assistant managers' bonuses in the assistant

managers' regular rate for purposes of calculating overtime pay.

37. Other employees, other than assistant managers, were eligible for

bonuses and were paid an hourly rate.

38. Other employees, other than assistant managers, who were eligible for

bonuses and were paid an hourly rate, worked more than forty hours per week in at

least one workweek within the three years preceding the filing of the Original Complaint.

39. Defendant did not include bonuses in other employees' regular rate for

purposes of calculating overtime pay.

40. Plaintiff proposes a collective class under the FLSA, which may be

preliminarily defined as follows:

Each hourly-paid employee who worked at one of Defendant's Arby's locations after October 30, 2014, and to whom Defendant paid a bonus pursuant to any bonus plan in at least one week in which the employee

worked more than forty hours per week.

41. The relevant time period dates back three years from the date on which

the Original Complaint was filed herein and continues forward through the date of

judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

42. The members of the proposed Bonus FLSA Class are similarly situated in

that they share these traits:

Page 6 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

a. They were classified by Defendant as non-exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA;

b. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of failing to include non-

discretionary bonuses in their regular rate of pay when calculating overtime pay; and

c. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of excluding bonuses

when calculating hourly workers' overtime rates.

43. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of potential members of the

Bonus FLSA Class but believes that the class exceeds five-hundred (500) persons.

44. Defendant can readily identify the members of the Section 16(b) class,

which encompass all hourly-plus-bonus employees at Defendant's fast-food

restaurants.

VI. AMWA RULE 23 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

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

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

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

Civil Procedure.

47. Plaintiff proposes a collective class under the FLSA, which may be

preliminarily defined as follows:

Each hourly-paid employee who worked at one of Defendant's Arby's locations in Arkansas after October 30, 2014, and to whom Defendant

paid a bonus pursuant to any bonus plan in at least one week in which the

employee worked more than forty hours per week.

Page 7 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

48. Upon information and belief, Defendant has employed more than forty (40)

hourly employees that also earn or earned bonuses within Arkansas. Therefore, the

proposed Bonus AMWA Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is

impracticable.

49. Common questions of law and fact relate to all of the proposed Bonus

AMWA Class members, such as:

a. Whether Defendant failed to include non-discretionary bonuses in class

members' regular rate of pay when calculating class members' overtime pay; and

b. Whether Defendant paid the 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.

50. The above common questions of law and fact for the class predominate

over any questions affecting only the individual named Plaintiff, and a class action is

superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the claims of

the members of the AMWA Class.

51. 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-exempt employees must be paid for time worked over forty

Page 8 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

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

Ann. § 11-4-211.

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

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

concerning the allegations in this Complaint.

53. Concentrating the litigation in this forum is highly desirable because

Defendant has a significant presence in the Eastern District of Arkansas and because

Plaintiff and all proposed Rule 23 class members work or worked within Arkansas.

54. No difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class

action.

55. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed Bonus

AMWA class in that Plaintiff worked as an hourly-paid employee who also received

bonuses from Defendant and experienced the same violations of the AMWA that all

other class members suffered.

56. Plaintiff and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of

the class.

57. Plaintiff's attorneys are competent to litigate Rule 23 class actions and

other complex litigation matters, including wage and hour cases like this one, and to the

extent, if any, that they find that they are not, they are able and willing to associate

additional counsel.

58. Prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the proposed

class would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to

Page 9 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

individual members of the proposed class that would establish incompatible standards

of conduct for Defendant.

VII. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

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

the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

61. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiff's "employer" within the

meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

62. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

enterprise engaged in commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

63. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to

pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to forty (40) in one week

and to pay time and a half of regular wages for all hours worked over forty (40) hours in

a week, unless an employee meets certain exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213

and all accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

64. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to overtime payments under the FLSA,

Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff an overtime rate of one and one-half times his regular

rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-week period.

65. Defendant's failure to properly pay overtime wages to Plaintiff stems from

Defendant's failing to include bonuses paid to Plaintiff when calculating overtime wages.

Page 10 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

66. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed was willful,

and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way it paid

Plaintiffs violated the FLSA.

67. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiff for monetary damages, liquidated damages, and costs, including reasonable

attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing

of this Complaint.

VIII. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

69. Plaintiff assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 et seq.

70. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiff's "employer" within the

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

71. Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-210 and 211 requires employers to

pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to forty in one week and to

pay one and one-half times regular wages for all hours worked over forty hours in a

week, unless an employee meets the exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and

accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

72. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to overtime payments under the AMWA,

Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff an overtime rate of one and one-half times his regular

rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-week period.

Page 11 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

73. Defendant's failure to properly pay overtime wages to Plaintiff stems from

Defendant's failing to include bonuses paid to Plaintiff when calculating overtime wages.

74. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed was willful,

and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way it paid Plaintiff

violated the AMWA.

75. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiff for monetary damages, liquidated damages, and costs, including reasonable

attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing

of this Complaint pursuant to Arkansas Code Annotated § 11-4-218.

IX. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Collective Action Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

77. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, assert

this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et

seq.

78. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

"employer" of Plaintiff and all those similarly situated within the meaning of the FLSA, 29

U.S.C. § 203.

76.

79. Defendant classified Plaintiff and all similarly situated members of the

Bonus FLSA Class as non-exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and

paid them non-discretionary bonuses.

Page 12 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

80. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and those similarly situated to overtime

payments under the FLSA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all those similarly

situated members of the Bonus FLSA Class an overtime rate of one and one-half times

their regular rates of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-week period.

81. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and members of the FLSA Class all

overtime wages owed was willful, and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard

for whether, the way it paid Plaintiff and members of the FLSA Class violated the FLSA.

82. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiff and members of the FLSA Class for monetary damages, liquidated damages,

and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the

three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

X. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Class Action Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

83.

84. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed AMWA

Class, assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the AMWA,

Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 et seq.

85. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

"employer" of Plaintiff and the members of the proposed AMWA class within the

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

86. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and the members of the proposed

Bonus AMWA Class to overtime payments under the AMWA, Defendant failed to pay

Page 13 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

Plaintiff and the members of the proposed class an overtime rate of one and one-half

times their regular rates of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-week

period.

87. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and members of the AMWA Class all

overtime wages owed was willful, and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard

for whether, the way it paid Plaintiff and members of the AMWA Class violated the

AMWA.

88. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiff and all members of the proposed AMWA Class for monetary damages,

liquidated damages, and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, for all violations

that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

XI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Richard Chunn, individually and on

behalf of all others similarly situated and the members of the proposed Section 216 and

Rule 23 classes, respectfully pray as follows:

A. That Defendant United States Beef Corporation be summoned to appear

and answer this Complaint;

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

and class members;

C. For an order of this Honorable Court entering judgment in their favor

against Defendant for their actual economic damages in an amount to be determined at

trial;

D. For liquidated damages as provided for under the FLSA and the AMWA;

Page 14 of 15
Richard Chunn, et al., v. United States Beef Corporation
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

- E. For their attorneys' fees, costs, and pre-judgment interest; and
- F. For such other and further relief as this Court deems necessary, just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD CHUNN, 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:

√Joshua West

Ark. Bar No. 2012121 west@sanfordlawfirm.com

and

Josh Sanford

Ark. Bar No. 2001037 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

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.

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE C	JF THIS FC	<i>РКМ.)</i>					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)  (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Sanford Law Firm, PLLC; 650 S. Shackleford Rd., Ste. 411, Little IAR 72211; 501-221-0088				DEFENDANTS United States Beef Corporation  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.  Attorneys (If Known)					
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	ment S 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only)  PTF DEF  zen of This State  1 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 4 4 4 4 6 4 6 6 Business In This State					DEF
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	Citiz	Citizen of Another State						
				en or Subject of a C reign Country	3 0 3	Foreign Nation		<b>0</b> 6	<b>0</b> 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			1 187	OPPETTION/PENALTY		here for: Nature of			
CONTRACT  ☐ 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	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 355 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   368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability   368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability   PERSONAL PROPEI   370 Other Fraud   371 Truth in Lending   380 Other Personal Property Damage   385 Property Damage   385 Property Damage Product Liability    PRISONER PETITIO   Habeas Corpus:   463 Alien Detainee   510 Motions to Vacate Sentence   530 General   535 Death Penalty Other:   540 Mandamus & Other:   550 Civil Rights   555 Prison Condition   560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	2Y	LABOR OTHER LABOR	422 Appe	SC 157  RTY RIGHTS  rights  at t - Abbreviated  Drug Application  mark  SECURITY  (1395ff)  at Lung (923)  C/DIWW (405(g))  Title XVI  405(g))  AL TAX SUTS  s (U.S. Plaintiff  efendant)	375 False Cl   376 Qui Tan 3729(a)   400 State Re   410 Antitrus   430 Banks a   450 Comme   460 Deporta   470 Rackete   470 Rackete   480 Consum   490 Cable/S   850 Securitis   Exchan   890 Other St   891 Agricult   893 Environs   895 Freedom   895 Freedom   896 Arbitrat   896 Arbitrat   899 Adminis   Act/Rev	n (31 USC)  ) apportionn it nd Banking ree tion ere Influenc Organizati er Credit at TV ess/Common ge tatutory Ac tural Acts mental Mat n of Inform ion strative Pro juecison utionality o	ment g sed and ons dities/ stions sters nation occdure
	moved from 3 tte Court  Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	Appellate Court  tute under which you a Seq.	•		er District	6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	ı <del>-</del>	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fil	n -
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  JURY DEMAND: □ Yes 又No					
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 10/30/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	O	SIONATURE OF AT	TORNEY (	OF RECORD					
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	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: Arby's Operating Company Miscalculates Overtime Rates</u>