#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

Ronald F. Harsh, Sr.,		*	
On behalf of himself and the similarly situated,	ose	*	Case No. 3:18-cv-2239
	Plaintiff,	*	Judge
		*	Magistrate Judge
v.		*	JURY DEMAND ENDORSED HEREON
Kalida Manufacturing, Inc.			
801 Ottawa St.		*	
P.O. Box 390			
Kalida, Ohio 45853		*	
	Defendant.	*	

## PLAINTIFF'S COLLECTIVE AND CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AND OHIO LAW

Now comes Plaintiff Ronald F. Harsh, Sr. ("Named Plaintiff" or "Harsh"), by and through undersigned counsel, individually and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, for his Complaint against Kalida Manufacturing, Inc ("Defendant" or "KMI") for its failure to pay employees overtime wages seeking all available relief under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, *et seq.*, the Ohio Minimum Fair Wage Standards Act, O.R.C. 4111.03, and 4111.08 ("the Ohio Wage Act"); and the Ohio Prompt Pay Act ("OPPA"), Ohio Rev. Code § 4113.15 (the Ohio Wage Act and the OPPA will be referred to collectively as "the Ohio Acts"). Named Plaintiff's FLSA claims are asserted as a collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), while the Ohio Acts claims are based on personal knowledge as to the Named

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 2 of 17. PageID #: 2

Plaintiff's own conduct and are made on information and belief as to the acts of others. Named Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, hereby states as follows:

#### I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 for violations of the FLSA.

2. This Court's jurisdiction in this matter is also predicated upon 28 U.S.C. § 1367, as this Complaint raises additional claims pursuant to the laws of Ohio (the Ohio Acts) over which this Court maintains supplemental subject matter jurisdiction because they form a part of the same case or controversy.

3. Venue is proper in this forum pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391, as a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to his claims occurred in the Northern District of Ohio, and Defendant has its principal place of business or it otherwise conducted substantial business in the Northern District of Ohio.

### II. <u>PARTIES</u>

4. Named Plaintiff is an individual, United States citizen, and resident of Pauling County, Ohio, which is in this judicial district.

 Named Plaintiff worked as an hourly, non-exempt "employee" of Defendant as defined in the FLSA and the Ohio Acts in the position of forklift operation in or around February, 2013 through August 2018.

6. During his employment with Defendant, Named Plaintiff was not fully and properly paid in accordance with the minimum requirements of the FLSA for all of his compensable hours worked because Defendant did not properly calculate overtime based on his <u>regular rate of pay</u>, as defined by the FLSA, but instead calculated overtime based on his hourly rate of pay, resulting

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 3 of 17. PageID #: 3

in unpaid overtime wages for the three years preceding the filing date of this Complaint and continuing until trial (three years preceding this filing date hereinafter "Relevant Time Period").

7. Named Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of those similarly situated and has given his written consent to bring this action to collect unpaid overtime compensation under the FLSA. Named Plaintiff's consent is being filed along with the Complaint pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b). (*Consent to be Party Plaintiff*, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**).

8. Defendant is a domestic for-profit corporation authorized to do business in Ohio that conducts business in this judicial district.

9. Defendant is and has been doing business in this judicial district.

10. At all times relevant, Defendant has been an "employer" as that term is defined by the FLSA and the Ohio Acts.

11. During relevant times, Defendant maintained control, oversight, and direction over Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees, including the promulgation and enforcement of policies affecting the payment of wages and overtime.

12. During relevant times, Defendant has benefitted from the work performed by Named Plaintiff and those similarly situated.

13. Upon information and belief, Defendant operated/operate and controls an enterprise and employs employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or has had employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person; and Defendant has had an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000 per year (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level).

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 4 of 17. PageID #: 4

14. Upon information and belief, Defendant, at all times relevant hereto, was fully aware of the fact that it was legally required to comply with the wage and overtime laws of the United States and of the State of Ohio.

#### III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

15. All of the preceding paragraphs are realleged as if fully rewritten herein.

16. During his employment with Defendant, Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were not fully and properly paid for all of their compensable hours worked because Defendant did not properly calculate their regular rate of pay for the purposes of meeting the minimum requirements set forth in the FLSA, resulting in unpaid overtime wages.

17. Defendant pays Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees an hourly wage for hours worked (hereinafter "Base Hourly Wage").

18. In addition to the Base Hourly Wage, Defendant pays their employees with additional forms of remuneration which should have been included in the calculation of employees' regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, including (1) non-discretionary "Attendance Bonuses" (also called "Thirteen Week Bonuses") as incentive for maintaining perfect attendance given it is important to the overall operation of KMI; and (2) non-discretionary "TPM Bonuses" as incentive for maintaining job safety (hereinafter Attendance Bonuses and TPM Bonuses will be referred to as "Additional Remuneration"). *See* 29 C.F.R §§ 778.207(b); 778.211(c).

19. During the last three years preceding the filing of this Complaint, Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees regularly received their Base Hourly Wage and Additional Remuneration as described above in various workweeks.

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 5 of 17. PageID #: 5

20. When Defendant paid Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees both their Base Hourly Wage and Additional Remuneration, Defendant failed to properly calculate their employees' regular rate of pay for the purposes of overtime pay because Defendant did not include the Additional Remuneration in its regular rate calculations for overtime wages. Consequently, Defendant failed to properly compensate Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees the overtime wages they were due in accordance with the minimum requirements of the FLSA.

21. Instead, Defendant paid Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees overtime compensation at one and one-half times their **<u>Base Hourly Wage</u>**, and not one and one-half times their <u>**regular rate of pay**</u>, as that phrase is defined under the FLSA. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 207(e).

22. Upon information and belief, Defendant, at all times relevant hereto, was fully aware of the fact that it was legally required to comply with the wage and overtime payment laws of the United States and of the State of Ohio.

23. During relevant times, Defendant had knowledge of and acted willfully regarding its conduct described herein.

24. Defendant is in possession and control of necessary documents and information from which Named Plaintiff would be able to precisely calculate damages.

25. For the three years preceding this filing, Defendant applied the same pay practices and policies to all hourly, non-exempt employees, including Named Plaintiff.

26. Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees have not been fully and lawfully compensated for all of their compensable hours worked due to the aforementioned policies and practices of not paying employees the correct overtime rate for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek.

27. Defendant knew or should have been aware that Named Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek and were entitled to be paid an overtime rate based on their <u>regular rate of pay</u>, as that phrase is defined under the FLSA, but it willfully elected not to fully compensate its employees during all times relevant.

#### IV. <u>COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS</u>

#### A. 216(b) Collective Action for Unpaid Overtime Wages.

28. Named Plaintiff brings his FLSA claims pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) as a representative action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated employees of the opt-in class, consisting of:

All current and former hourly, non-exempt employees of Defendant, who received a Base Hourly Wage and Additional Remuneration during any workweek that they worked over 40 hours in any workweek beginning three years preceding the filing date of this Complaint and continuing through the date of final disposition of this case (the "§216(b) Collective Class" or the "§216(b) Collective Class Members").

29. This FLSA claim is brought as an "opt-in" collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. \$216(b) as to claims for overtime compensation withheld in violation of the FLSA, liquidated damages, and attorneys' fees.

30. In addition to the Named Plaintiff, the putative §216(b) Collective Class Members have been denied overtime compensation due to Defendant's company-wide payroll policy and practice of not fully and properly compensating their employees at the proper overtime rate during workweeks when they worked more than forty (40) hours per workweek and were paid their Base Hourly Wage and Additional Remuneration. Defendant failed to meet the minimum requirements of the FLSA by not paying Named Plaintiff and the putative §216(b) Collective Class Members overtime at a rate of at least one and one-half times their <u>regular rate of pay</u>, as that phrase is defined under the FLSA, for all overtime hours worked. The Named Plaintiff is representative of

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 7 of 17. PageID #: 7

those other similarly situated employees and is acting on behalf of their interests as well as his own in bringing this action.

31. The identity of the putative §216(b) Collective Class Members are known to Defendant and are readily identifiable through Defendant's payroll records. These individuals may readily be notified of this action and allowed to opt into it pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b), for the purpose of collectively adjudicating their claims for overtime compensation, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and costs under the FLSA.

32. The net effect of Defendant's policies and practices is that Defendant willfully failed to fully and properly pay Named Plaintiff and §216(b) Collective Class Members overtime wages. Thus, Defendant enjoyed substantial profits at the expense of the Named Plaintiff and §216(b) Collective Class Members.

## B. Fed.R.Civ. P. 23 Class Action for Unpaid Overtime Wages.

33. Named Plaintiff brings his Ohio Wage Act claims pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 23 as a class action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated of the following class, consisting of:

All current and former hourly, non-exempt employees of Defendant working in Ohio, who received a Base Hourly Wage and Additional Remuneration during any workweek that they worked over 40 hours in any workweek beginning three years preceding the filing date of this Complaint and continuing through the date of final disposition of this case (the "Ohio Rule 23 Class", the "Rule 23 Class", or the "Ohio Rule 23 Class Members").

34. During relevant times, Named Plaintiff and those Ohio Rule 23 Class Members worked more than forty (40) hours per workweek, but were not correctly compensated at a rate of at least one and one-half times their correct *regular rate of pay*, as that phrase is defined under the FLSA, for all hours worked in excess of 40 because of Defendant's policy and practice of not fully

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 8 of 17. PageID #: 8

compensating its employees at the proper overtime rate during workweeks when they received additional forms of remuneration as described herein.

35. The Ohio Rule 23 Class, as defined above, is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

36. Named Plaintiff is a member of the Ohio Rule 23 Class and his claims for unpaid wages are typical of the claims of other members of the Ohio Rule 23 Class.

37. Named Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the Ohio Rule 23 Class and the interests of all members of the Ohio Rule 23 Class.

38. Named Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to or in conflict with those interests of the Ohio Rule 23 Class that he has undertaken to represent.

39. Named Plaintiff has retained competent and experienced class action counsel who can ably represent the interests of the entire Ohio Rule 23 Class.

40. Questions of law and fact are common to the Ohio Rule 23 Class.

41. Class certification is appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1) because individual actions would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant with respect to its non-exempt employees.

42. Class certification is appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) as Defendant acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Ohio Rule 23 Class, making appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class as a whole.

43. Class certification is appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) as the questions of law and facts common to the Ohio Rule 23 Class predominate over questions affecting individual

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 9 of 17. PageID #: 9

members of the Ohio Rule 23 Class and because a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation.

44. Questions of law and fact that are common to the Ohio Rule 23 Class include, but are not limited to: (a) whether Defendant violated the Ohio Wage Act by failing to pay the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members their correct overtime rate for all hours worked in excess of forty hours per week as a result of Defendant's failure to properly calculate the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members' regular rate of pay when they received Additional Remuneration; (b) whether Defendant's violations of the Ohio Wage Act were knowing and willful; (c) what amount of unpaid and/or withheld overtime compensation is due to the Named Plaintiff and other members of the Ohio Rule 23 Class on account of Defendant's violations of the Ohio Wage Act; and (d) what amount of prejudgment interest is due to Ohio Rule 23 Class members on the overtime or other compensation which was withheld or not paid to them.

45. A class action is superior to individual actions for the fair and efficient adjudication of Named Plaintiff's and the Ohio Rule 23 Class' claims and will prevent undue financial, administrative and procedural burdens on the parties and the Court. Named Plaintiff and counsel are not aware of any pending Ohio litigation on behalf of the Ohio Rule 23 Class, as defined herein, or on behalf of any individual alleging a similar claim. Because the damages sustained by individual members are modest compared to the costs of individual litigation, it would be impractical for class members to pursue individual litigation against the Defendant to vindicate their rights. Certification of this case as a class action will enable the issues to be adjudicated for all class members with the efficiencies of class litigation.

## V. <u>CAUSES OF ACTION</u>

# (FLSA – COLLECTIVE ACTION FOR UNPAID OVERTIME)

46. All of the preceding paragraphs are realleged as if fully rewritten herein.

47. This claim is brought as part of a collective action by the Named Plaintiff on behalf of himself and the §216(b) Collective Class Members.

48. During the relevant time period preceding this Complaint, Defendant employed the Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members.

49. Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members were paid on an hourly basis when working in non-exempt positions.

50. Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members worked in excess of 40 hours in numerous workweeks during their employment.

51. The FLSA requires that covered employees be compensated for every hour worked in a workweek. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 206(b).

52. The FLSA requires that non-exempt employees receive overtime compensation of their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

53. Under 29 U.S.C. § 207(e), "regular rate" of pay shall be broadly deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf of, the employee like the type of Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 207(e); *see also* 29 C.F.R §§ 778.207(b); 778.208; 778.211(c).

54. Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members were not exempt from receiving FLSA overtime compensation.

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 11 of 17. PageID #: 11

55. Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members worked in excess of forty hours in workweeks during all times relevant.

56. Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members should have been paid the correct overtime rate for all hours worked in excess of forty hours per workweek during the three years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

57. Defendant violated the FLSA with respect to Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members by, *inter alia*, failing to *fully* compensate them at time-and-one-half times their regular rates of pay for hours worked over forty (40) hours in workweeks because Defendant did not properly calculate its employees' overtime rate when they received Additional Remuneration as described herein.

58. Defendant knew or should have known of the overtime payment requirements of the FLSA. Defendant willfully withheld and failed to pay the overtime compensation to which Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members are entitled.

59. The exact total amount of overtime compensation that Defendant failed to pay the Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Collective Class Members is unknown at this time, as many of the records necessary to make such precise calculations are in Defendant's possession.

60. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, the Named Plaintiff and the \$216(b) Collective Class Members have suffered and continue to suffer damages. The Named Plaintiff seeks unpaid overtime and other compensation, liquidated damages, interest and attorneys' fees, and all other remedies available, on behalf of himself and the \$216(b) Collective Class Members.

#### <u>COUNT II</u> (R.C. § 4111.03 – RULE 23 CLASS ACTION FOR UNPAID OVERTIME)

61. All of the preceding paragraphs are realleged as if fully rewritten herein.

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 12 of 17. PageID #: 12

62. This claim is brought under Ohio law, which incorporates the FLSA without limitation.

63. The Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members have been employed by Defendant and Defendant is an employer covered by the overtime requirements under Ohio law.

64. Ohio law requires that employees receive overtime compensation "not less than one and one-half times" (1.5) the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in one workweek, "in the manner and methods provided in and subject to the exemptions of section 7 and section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1937." *See* R.C. § 4111.03(A); *see also* 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

65. The Named Plaintiff and Ohio Rule 23 Class worked in excess of the maximum weekly hours permitted under R.C. § 4111.03 but were not correctly paid their overtime rate for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek when they received Additional Remuneration as described herein.

66. Defendant's company-wide corporate policy and/or practice of not properly paying its hourly, non-exempt employees the *correct* overtime rate for each hour worked over forty (40) hours in workweeks when employees also received Additional Remuneration as described herein resulted in unpaid overtime wages for the Named Plaintiff and Ohio Rule 23 Class.

67. Named Plaintiff and those similarly situated Ohioans were not exempt from the wage protections of Ohio law.

68. Defendant violated the Ohio Wage Act with respect to Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class by, *inter alia*, failing to compensate them at time-and-one-half times their correct regular rates of pay for hours worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek because

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 13 of 17. PageID #: 13

Defendant did not properly calculate its employees' overtime rate when they received Additional Remuneration as described herein.

69. The Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class were not exempt from the wage protections of Ohio law.

70. Defendant's repeated and knowing failure to pay overtime wages to the Named Plaintiff and those similarly situated Ohioans were violations of R.C. §4111.03, and as such, Defendant acted willfully.

71. For Defendant's violations of R.C. §4111.03, by which the Named Plaintiff and those similarly situated Ohioans have suffered and continue to suffer damages; the Named Plaintiff and those similarly situated Ohioans seek unpaid overtime and other compensation, liquidated damages, interest and attorneys' fees, and all other remedies available.

## (R.C. § 4113.15 – RULE 23 CLASS ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE OHIO PROMPT PAY ACT)

72. All of the preceding paragraphs are realleged as if fully rewritten herein.

73. During relevant times, Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members have been employed by Defendant.

74. During relevant times, Defendant was an entity covered by the OPPA and the Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members have been employed by Defendant within the meaning of the OPPA.

75. The OPPA requires Defendant to pay Named Plaintiff and Ohio Rule 23 Class all wages, including unpaid overtime, on or before the first day of each month, for wages earned by them during the first half of the preceding month ending with the fifteenth day thereof, and on

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 14 of 17. PageID #: 14

or before the fifteenth day of each month, for wages earned by them during the last half of the preceding calendar month. *See* R.C. § 4113.15(A).

76. During relevant times, Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class were not paid all wages, including overtime wages at one and one-half times their regular rate of pay as described herein within thirty (30) days of performing the work. *See* R.C. § 4113.15(B).

77. The Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members' unpaid wages remain unpaid for more than thirty (30) days beyond their regularly scheduled payday.

78. The Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members have been harmed and continue to be harmed by such unpaid wages.

79. In violating the OPPA, Defendant acted willfully, without a good faith basis, and with reckless disregard of clearly applicable Ohio law.

## VI. <u>PRAYER FOR RELIEF</u>

**WHEREFORE**, as to **Count I**, Named Plaintiff and other members of the § 216(b) Class pray for an Order against Defendant as follows:

A. Certifying the proposed FLSA collective action;

B. Directing prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to the §216(b) Class apprising them of the pendency of this action and permitting them to timely assert their rights under the FLSA;

C. A declaratory judgment that Defendant's payroll policy or practice of not properly calculating the overtime rate during workweeks when its employees received Additional Remuneration for Named Plaintiff and the § 216(b) Class as described herein violates the FLSA;

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 15 of 17. PageID #: 15

D. An order for injunctive relief ordering Defendant to end all of the illegal wage policy and practice alleged herein pursuant to the FLSA and attendant regulations and requiring Defendant to follow such laws going forward;

E. Judgment against Defendant for damages for all unpaid overtime compensation owed to Named Plaintiff and the §216(b) Class during the applicable statutory period under the FLSA and continuing through trial;

F. Judgment against Defendant for liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA in an amount equal to all unpaid overtime compensation owed to Named Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees during the applicable statutory period under the FLSA and continuing through trial;

G. Directing Defendant to pay reasonable attorney's fees and all costs connected with this action;

H. Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by the Court;

I. Judgment for all civil penalties to which Named Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees may be entitled; and

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

**WHEREFORE**, as to **Counts II** and **III**, Named Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for violations of the Ohio Acts, and for an Order as follows:

K. A declaratory judgment that Defendant's wage and hour policies and practices as alleged herein violate the Ohio Wage Act with respect to the non-payment of overtime and violations of the OPPA;

#### Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 16 of 17. PageID #: 16

L. An order for injunctive relief ordering Defendant to end all of the illegal wage policy and practice alleged herein pursuant to the Ohio Wage Act and the OPPA, and requiring Defendant to follow such laws going forward;

M. An Order certifying the proposed Ohio Rule 23 Class under the Ohio Wage Act and the OPPA;

N. Awarding to the Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members unpaid compensation, including overtime wages as to be determined at trial together with any liquidated damages allowed by Ohio law;

O. Awarding Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members costs and disbursements and reasonable allowances for fees of counsel and experts, and reimbursement of expenses;

P. Awarding judgment against Defendant for liquidated damages pursuant to the OPPA in an amount equal to six percent (6%) of all unpaid overtime compensation owed to the Named Plaintiff and the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members during the applicable statutory period; and

Q. Awarding Named Plaintiff, the Ohio Rule 23 Class Members such other and further relief as the Court deems necessary, just, or proper.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/ Matthew J.P. Coffman</u> Matthew J.P. Coffman (0085586) **Coffman Legal, LLC** 1457 S. High St. Columbus, Ohio 43207 Phone: 614-949-1181 Fax: 614-386-9964 Email: mcoffman@mcoffmanlegal.com

/s/ Daniel I. Bryant Daniel I. Bryant (0090859) BRYANT LEGAL, LLC

Page 16 of 17

Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1 Filed: 09/28/18 17 of 17. PageID #: 17

1457 S. High St. Columbus, Ohio 43207 Phone: (614) 704-0546 Facsimile: (614) 573-9826 Email: dbryant@bryantlegalllc.com

Attorneys for Named Plaintiff and those similarly situated

## JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff requests a trial by a jury of twelve (12) persons.

<u>/s/ Matthew J.P. Coffman</u> Matthew J.P. Coffman

## Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1-1 Filed: 09/28/18 1 of 3. PageID #: 18

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					
Ronald F. Harsh, Sr.				Kalida Manufacturing, Inc.						
(b) County of Residence of	Fright Listed Plaintiff			County of Posidenas	of First List	ad Dafandant				
., .	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ISES)		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)						
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATI	ON CASES, USE T VOLVED.	HE LOCATION C	)F		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, .	Address, and Telephone Numbe	r)		Attorneys (If Known)						
Matthew J.P. Coffman - ( Daniel I. Bryant - Bryant										
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in and One Box fo			
I U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		P	IF DEF	Incorporated or Pr of Business In T	rincipal Place	PTF O 4	DEF d 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and F of Business In A		05	05	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		<b>6</b>	06	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT					Click	here for: Nature of				
CONTRACT	TC	DRTS		DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	IKRUPTCY	OTHER		ES	
<ul> <li>110 Insurance</li> <li>120 Marine</li> </ul>	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR	Y 🗆 62	5 Drug Related Seizure		al 28 USC 158	□ 375 False Cla □ 376 Oui Tam		•	
I 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	<b>D</b> 69	of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	□ 423 With 28 U	drawal ISC 157	3729(a))			
140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	G 367 Health Care/		- Juli			d 400 State Rea	apportionn	nent	
□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical				RTY RIGHTS	410 Antitrust			
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			□ 820 Copy □ 830 Paten		<ul> <li>430 Banks an</li> <li>450 Comment</li> </ul>		ş	
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	368 Asbestos Personal				at - Abbreviated	d 460 Deportat			
Student Loans	340 Marine	Injury Product			New	Drug Application	470 Racketee	r Influence		
(Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product				340 Trade			Organizatio	ons	
of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud		LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards	0 861 HIA	SECURITY	480 Consume 490 Cable/Sa			
□ 160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	□ 371 Truth in Lending	<b></b>	Act	362 Black		□ 850 Securitie		dities/	
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	380 Other Personal	0 72	0 Labor/Management	🗇 863 DIW	C/DIWW (405(g))	Exchang			
<ul> <li>195 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>196 Franchise</li> </ul>	360 Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations	□ 864 SSID		□ 890 Other Sta		tions	
176 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability		0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical	🗇 865 RSI (	405(g))	891 Agricult     893 Environn		ters	
	Medical Malpractice	Troublet Shability		Leave Act			B 895 Freedom			
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION		0 Other Labor Litigation		L TAX SUITS	Act			
210 Land Condemnation     220 Foreclosure	440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detaince	0 79	1 Employee Retirement		s (U.S. Plaintiff	B96 Arbitrati			
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voung     442 Employment	10 463 Alien Detaince 10 510 Motions to Vacate		Income Security Act	07 Do	efendant) _Third Party		ew or App		
240 Torts to Land	I 443 Housing/	Sentence				SC 7609	Agency [			
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	530 General			1		950 Constitut		£	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	535 Death Penalty Other:	<b>C</b> 44	2 Naturalization Application	4		State Stat	utes		
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Othe		5 Other Immigration						
	Other	550 Civil Rights		Actions						
	448 Education	<ul> <li>555 Prison Condition</li> <li>560 Civil Detainee -</li> </ul>								
		Conditions of								
		Confinement								
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	n One Box Only)									
		Remanded from C Appellate Court	J 4 Reins Reop		r District	6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	1-	Multidist Litigation Direct Fil	n -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	L Fair Labor Standa	ards Act of 1938 ("F	re filing (D FLSA"), 2	Do not cite jurisdictional stat 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et	utes unless div seq., and	versity): O.R.C. 4111,	et seq.			
	Brief description of ca		are own	ed overtime compensi	eation for .	nrovious 3 vor	are .			
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$		HECK YES only		oomolair		
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2			EMAND 5		URY DEMAND:			ц.	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):				-					
		JUDGE	ORNEY O	ERECED		T NUMBER				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	4	12	5	<u></u>						
RECEIPT # AN	10UNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	OGE			

Case: 3:18-cv-02239-JJH Doc #: 1-1 Filed: 09/28/18 2 of 3. PageID #: 19

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

l.	Civil Categories: (Please check one category only).
	<ol> <li>General Civil</li> <li>Administrative Review/Social Security</li> <li>Habeas Corpus Death Penalty</li> </ol>
	*If under Title 28, §2255, name the SENTENCING JUDGE:
	CASE NUMBER:
I <b>I.</b>	RELATED OR REFILED CASES. See LR 3.1 which provides in pertinent part: "If an action is filed or removed to this Court
	and assigned to a District Judge after which it is discontinued, dismissed or remanded to a State court, and subsequently refiled, it shall be assigned to the same Judge who received the initial case assignment without regardfor the place of holding court in which the case was refiled. Counsel or a party without counsel shall be responsible for bringing such cases to the attention of the Court by responding to the questions included on the Civil Cover Sheet."
	This action: is RELATED to another PENDING civil case is a REFILED case was PREVIOUSLY REMAND

was PREVIOUSLY REMANDED

If applicable, please indicate on page 1 in section VIII, the name of the Judge and case number.

Ш. In accordance with Local Civil Rule 3.8, actions involving counties in the Eastern Division shall be filed at any of the divisional offices therein. Actions involving counties in the Western Division shall be filed at the Toledo office. For the purpose of determining the proper division, and for statistical reasons, the following information is requested.

ANSWER ONE PARAGRAPH ONLY. ANSWER PARAGRAPHS 1 THRU 3 IN ORDER. UPON FINDING WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES TO YOUR CASE, ANSWER IT AND STOP.

(1) Resident defendant. If the defendant resides in a county within this district, please set forth the name of such county

Putnam County COUNTY:

TOLEDO

Corporation For the purpose of answering the above, a corporation is deemed to be a resident of that county in which it has its principal place of business in that district.

(2) Non-Resident defendant. If no defendant is a resident of a county in this district, please set forth the county wherein the cause of action arose or the event complained of occurred.

COUNTY:

(3) Other Cases. If no defendant is a resident of this district, or if the defendant is a corporation not having a principle place of business within the district, and the cause of action arose or the event complained of occurred outside this district, please set forth the county of the plaintiff's residence.

COUNTY:

IV. The Counties in the Northern District of Ohio are divided into divisions as shown below. After the county is determined in Section III, please check the appropriate division.

EASTERN DIVISION	
AKRON	(Counties: Carroll, Holmes, Portage, Stark, Summit, Tuscarawas an
	(Counties: Ashland, Ashtabula, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina and Richland)
YOUNGSTOWN	(Counties: Columbiana, Mahoning and Trumbull)
WESTERN DIVISION	

(Counties: Allen, Auglaize, Defiance, Erie, Fulton, Hancock, Hardin, Henry, Huron, Lucas, Marion, Mercer, Ottawa, Paulding, Putnam, Sandusky, Seneca VanWert, Williams, Wood and Wyandot)

Portage, Stark, Summit, Tuscarawas and Wayne)

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

#### Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below. United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box. Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked. Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

## **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Former Employee Alleges Kalida Manufacturing Owes Unpaid OT</u>