EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS JONESBORO DIVISION

JUL 27 **201**7

JAMES W. McCQRMACK, CLERK

PLAINTIFFS

ZAKKERY CROCKER and BRANDON WOMACK, Individually and on **Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated**

VS.

No. 3:17-cv- 191 - DPM

CITY OF LEACHVILLE, ARKANSAS

DEFENDANT

This case assigned to District Judge Marshall

and to Magistrate Judge ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—COLLECTIVE ACTION

COME NOW Plaintiffs Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through their attorneys Stacy Gibson and Josh Sanford of Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and for their Original Complaint— Collective Action against Defendant City of Leachville, Arkansas ("Defendant"), they do hereby state and allege as follows:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

- 1. This is an action brought by Plaintiffs Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated ("Plaintiffs"), against Defendant for violations of the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. (the "FLSA"), and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. (the "AMWA").
- Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, seek 2. declaratory judgment; monetary damages; liquidated damages; prejudgment interest; costs; and a reasonable attorney's fee, as a result of Defendant's policy and practice of

Page 1 of 10 Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-**Original Complaint—Collective Action**

failing to pay Plaintiffs and other similarly situated individuals proper overtime

compensation under the FLSA and under the AMWA within the applicable statutory

limitations period.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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. Plaintiffs' 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. Therefore, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' AMWA

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

5. A substantial part of the acts complained of herein were committed and

had their principal effect against Plaintiffs, within the Jonesboro Division of the Eastern

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

§ 1391.

III. THE PARTIES

6. Plaintiff Zakkery Crocker is an individual and resident of Mississippi

County.

7. Plaintiff Brandon Womack is an individual and resident of Mississippi

County.

8. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs have been entitled to the rights,

protections and benefits provided under the FLSA and the AMWA.

Page 2 of 10

Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

9. As employees of Defendant, Plaintiffs were employees of a public agency

employed in law enforcement activities, and therefore entitled to the protections of the

FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 213(b)(20).

10. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs have been misclassified by

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

11. 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, Plaintiffs'

employer.

12. Defendant is an employer subject to the FLSA as a public agency

pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203.

13. Defendant participated in the management of Plaintiffs' work, including

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

compensation paid.

14. Defendant 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.

15. Defendant City of Leachville, Arkansas, operates the City of Leachville

Police Department where Plaintiffs were employed within the three (3) years prior to the

filing of this Complaint as law enforcement officers.

16. Defendant can be served through Mayor Lisa Baldridge, 116 South Main

Street, Leachville, Arkansas 72438.

17. At all relevant times, Defendant employed five or more employees in law

enforcement activities pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 213(b)(20).

Page 3 of 10

Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-____

Original Complaint—Collective Action

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

18. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as

though fully incorporated in this section.

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

salaried employees of the Leachville Police Department located in Leachville, Arkansas.

20. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant as law

enforcement officers.

21. Plaintiff Zakkery Crocker was employed by Defendant from approximately

April 18, 2016, to June 2, 2017, as a Sheriff's Deputy and Certified K-9 Handler.

22. Plaintiff Brandon Womack was employed by Defendant from

approximately October of 2016 to June 29, 2017, as a Lieutenant.

23. Defendant did not establish a work period for the police department

pursuant to the FLSA.

24. Plaintiffs were routinely required to work in excess of forty hours per week

and were not allowed to report all hours worked, including overtime.

25. Plaintiffs were specifically instructed not to report their hours worked,

including overtime, and instead were told to write "salary" on a timesheet to submit for

weekly payment.

26. Defendant knew about Plaintiffs' working in excess of forty hours per week

and required them to do so.

27. Defendant did not pay Plaintiffs any overtime compensation because

Defendant misclassified Plaintiffs as salaried employees exempt from the requirements

of the FLSA.

Page 4 of 10

Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

28. Defendant did not provide Plaintiffs with compensatory time off for hours

worked over forty each week.

29. Plaintiffs spent the majority of their workdays patrolling the city, writing

traffic citations, and completing paperwork relating to incidents they responded to.

30. During the course of their employment, Plaintiffs did not manage the

enterprise or a customarily recognized subdivision of the enterprise.

31. Plaintiffs did not select any employees for hire nor did they provide any

formal training for any employees.

32. Plaintiffs had no ability to hire and fire any employee.

33. Plaintiffs did not have any control of or authority over any employee's rate

of pay or working hours.

34. Plaintiffs did not maintain or prepare production reports or sales records

for use in supervision or control of the business.

35. Plaintiffs did not have any responsibility for planning or controlling

budgets.

36. Plaintiffs were explicitly directed by Defendant to not report their hours

worked because it was Defendant's policy not to pay Plaintiffs overtime.

37. Plaintiffs' actual day-to-day job duties and responsibilities were not exempt

under the FLSA with respect to payment for time worked in excess of forty (40) hours

each week.

38. Plaintiffs' primary duties were policing, not managing other police officers.

39. Plaintiffs regularly worked in excess of forty hours in a week and did not

receive any overtime compensation.

Page 5 of 10

Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-____
Original Complaint—Collective Action

40. Although Plaintiffs had assigned shifts, Plaintiffs were frequently on call

and had to address emergencies, which resulted in working many additional hours over

the scheduled shifts. This work frequently included evenings, holidays and weekends.

41. During this on-call time, Plaintiffs' actions were severely restricted and

they were expected to respond immediately to any request of Defendant.

42. Plaintiff Zakkery Crocker had to spend additional hours each week

training, feeding and grooming his canine, but he was not compensated in any way for

this time.

43. Courts have consistently held that feeding, grooming and walking are

indispensable parts of maintaining dogs as law enforcement tools, that such activities

are closely related to the duties of a canine officer, and that therefore, they are time

spent working. Levering v. District of Columbia, 869 F.Supp. 24, 27 (D.D.C.1994)

("[F]eeding, exercising, and caring for the dogs by officers assigned to the canine

detachment constitutes an 'integral and indispensable part' of the officers' work

activities, and, as such, time spent on those activities is compensable under the Fair

Labor Standards Act."); Truslow v. Spotsylvania County Sheriff, 783 F.Supp. 274, 277,

279 (E.D.Va.1992) (same).

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

the Complaint, Defendant has willfully and intentionally committed violations of the

FLSA as described, infra.

V. REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

45. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as

though fully incorporated in this section.

46. Plaintiffs brings their 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).

47. Plaintiffs bring their FLSA claims on behalf of all law enforcement officers

employed by Defendant at any time within the applicable statute of limitations period,

who were classified by Defendant as exempt from the overtime requirements of the

FLSA and are entitled to payment of the following types of damages:

a. Payment for all hours worked, including overtime premiums for all hours

worked for Defendant in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek; and

b. Liquidated damages and attorneys' fees and costs.

48. In conformity with the requirements of FLSA Section 16(b), Plaintiffs have

attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B" written Consents to Join this lawsuit.

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

Plaintiffs' Original Complaint—Collective Action was filed herein and continues forward

through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

50. The members of the proposed FLSA Class are similarly situated in that

they share these traits:

a. They were classified by Defendants as exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA;

b. They were paid a salary;

c. They recorded their time in the same manner; and

d. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of denying overtime pay

for all hours worked over forty (40) per work week.

51. Plaintiffs are unable to state the exact number of the potential members of

the FLSA Class but believe that the class exceeds fourteen (14) persons.

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

The names and physical and mailing addresses of the FLSA collective action plaintiffs

are available from Defendant, and a Court-approved Notice should be provided to the

FLSA collective action plaintiffs via first class mail, email and text message to their last

known physical and electronic mailing addresses and cell phone numbers as soon as

possible, together with other documents and information descriptive of Plaintiffs' FLSA

claim.

VI. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claims for Violations of the FLSA)

53. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as

though fully incorporated in this section.

54. Plaintiffs assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

55. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiffs' "employer" within the

meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

56. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiffs to minimum wage and overtime

payments under the FLSA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs an overtime rate of one

and one-half times their regular rate of pay for all overtime hours worked. Defendant's

failure to pay Plaintiffs all overtime wages owed was willful.

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

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

Page 8 of 10

Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-____

Original Complaint—Collective Action

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

VII. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claims for Violations of the AMWA)

- 58. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.
- 59. Plaintiffs assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201, et seq.
- 60. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiffs' "employer" within the meaning of the AMWA, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-203(4).
- 61. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiffs to minimum wage and overtime payments under the AMWA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked including overtime.
 - 62. Defendant willfully failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiffs.
- 63. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs 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.

VIII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Collective Action Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

64. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.

65. Plaintiffs, 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.

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

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

29 U.S.C. § 203.

67. Defendant misclassified Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated as

exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA, when in fact they were non-

exempt employees entitled to overtime pay.

68. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiffs and those similarly situated to overtime

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

situated 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.

69. Defendant willfully failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiffs and to others

similarly situated.

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

Plaintiffs and all those similarly situated 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.

IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiffs Zakkery Crocker and Brandon

Womack respectfully pray as follows:

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

Page 10 of 10

Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-____

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

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;

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

to Plaintiffs 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 seg., and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. §516 et seg., in an

amount equal to all unpaid overtime compensation owed to Plaintiffs 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.

Page 11 of 10

Zakkery Crocker and Brandon Womack v. City of Leachville
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

Respectfully submitted,

ZAKKERY CROCKER and BRANDON WOMACK, 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:

Stacy Gibson

Ark. Bar No. 2014171 stacy@sanfordlawfirm.com

and

Josh Sanford Ark. Bar No. 2001037 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS JONESBORO DIVISION

ZAKKERY CROCKER and BRANDON WOMACK, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFFS

vs.

No. 3:17-cv-____

CITY OF LEACHVILLE, ARKANSAS

DEFENDANT

CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION

I was employed as a salaried law enforcement officer for Defendant City of Leachville, Arkansas ("Defendant"), on or after July 27, 2014. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for unpaid overtime compensation. I consent to becoming a party-plaintiff in this lawsuit, to be represented by Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and to be bound by any settlement of this action or adjudication by the Court.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature:

ZAKKERY CROCKER

Date: July 27, 2017

/s/ Josh Sanford
Josh Sanford, Esq.
SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC
One Financial Center
650 South Shackleford Road, Suite 411
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088
Facsimile: (888) 787-2040
josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS JONESBORO DIVISION

ZAKKERY CROCKER and BRANDON WOMACK, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

No. 3:17-cv-____

CITY OF LEACHVILLE, ARKANSAS

DEFENDANT

CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION

I was employed as a salaried law enforcement officer for Defendant City of Leachville, Arkansas ("Defendant"), on or after July 27, 2014. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for unpaid overtime compensation. I consent to becoming a party-plaintiff in this lawsuit, to be represented by Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and to be bound by any settlement of this action or adjudication by the Court.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature:

BRANDON WOMACK

Date: July 27, 2017

/s/ Josh Sanford
Josh Sanford, Esq.
SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC
One Financial Center
650 South Shackleford Road, Suite 411
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088

Facsimile: (888) 787-2040 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT

CIVIL COVER SHEET 3:17-cv-191-DPM

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						
ZAKKERY CROCKER and BRANDON WOMACK, Individually and Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated				on CITY OF LEACHVILLE, ARKANSAS						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Mississippi				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant						
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)						
·						N CASES, USE TI	HE LOCATION OF			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				Attorneys (If Known)						
Stacy Gibson, Josh Sanfo Shackleford, Suite 411, L josh@sanfordlawfirm.com	ittle Rock, AR 72211;	, - ,								
				TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One and One Box for D		55	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)			Citiz		TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T	incipal Place	ΓF 3 4	DEF 0 4	
☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity Defendant			Citiz	en of Another State	Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 5 of Business In Another State					
				Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country						
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	,	Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.								
CONTRACT		RTS		ORFEITURE/PENALTY		KRUPTCY	OTHER STA		ES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury -	Y 10 62	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appea ☐ 423 Withd	1 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Claims ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31)			
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	- 69	Of Property 21 OSC 881	28 USC 157		3729(a))			
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	367 Health Care/					☐ 400 State Reapportionment			
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical				TY RIGHTS	410 Antitrust	1	_	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			☐ 820 Copyr ☐ 830 Patent		☐ 430 Banks and B☐ 450 Commerce	sanking	g	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal	ı			- Abbreviated	☐ 460 Deportation			
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product				Orug Application	☐ 470 Racketeer In			
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	.TV	LABOR	☐ 840 Trade	mark SECURITY	Corrupt Orga 480 Consumer C		ons	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		10 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (490 Cable/Sat T			
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 371 Truth in Lending		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)		☐ 850 Securities/C		dities/	
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	380 Other Personal	0 72	0 Labor/Management Relations 863 DIWC/DIWW (49						
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage 385 Property Damage	I 74	Relations 10 Railway Labor Act	☐ 864 SSID		☐ 890 Other Statut ☐ 891 Agricultural		tions	
- 170 Flancinsc	362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability		51 Family and Medical	B 605 RSI (405(g))		893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information			
	Medical Malpractice			Leave Act						
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO		00 Other Labor Litigation		L TAX SUITS	Act			
220 Foreclosure	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	1	(U.S. Plaintiff fendant)	☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrati	ive Pro	cedure	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate	.	ancome booming race	☐ 871 IRS—	,	Act/Review			
240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence			26 US	SC 7609	Agency Dec		_	
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 530 General☐ 535 Death Penalty	_	IMMIGRATION	-		☐ 950 Constitution State Statute		ī	
2 20 mil Galet Real Froperty	Employment	Other:	O 40	52 Naturalization Application	1		State Statute			
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Oth		55 Other Immigration	1					
	Other 448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Actions	1					
	B 440 Education	560 Civil Detainee -								
		Conditions of								
		Confinement								
	moved from	Remanded from (Appellate Court	□ 4 Rein Reo		erred from er District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation	- Lit	igatio	n -	
	Total transition			(specify)		Transfer	Dir	ect Fil	le	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	itute under which you a: .; A.C.A. 11-4-201,	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless div	ersity):				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca FLSA and AMWA	iuse:	et seq.			AME				
VII. REQUESTED IN	·······		y n	EMAND \$	CI	IECK VES only	if demanded in ac-	mplair	nt·	
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				ENIANDS	AND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND:					
VIII. RELATED CASI				-						
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	NUMBER				
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD	VI.	4/				
07/27/2017						7)				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					0					
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE			

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Two Fmr. Police Officers Sue Leachville, AR Over Allegedly Unpaid OT