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

RAYMOND HATCHER, Individually and on behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

VS.

No. 3:17-cv-190-DPM

This case assigned to District Judge

and to Magistrate Judge\_4

**DEFENDANTS** 

FRANK A. ROGERS & CO., INC., and EDWARD SCOGGINS

# ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—COLLECTIVE ACTION

COMES NOW Plaintiff Raymond Hatcher ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys Stacy Gibson and Josh Sanford of Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and for his Original Complaint—Collective Action against Defendants Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., and Edward Scoggins (collectively "Defendants"), and in support thereof he does hereby state and allege as follows:

#### I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

- 1. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, brings this action against Defendants for violations of the overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act ("AMWA").
- Plaintiff seeks to certify a collective action pursuant to Section 216 of the FLSA and a class action pursuant to the AMWA and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 3. Plaintiff further seeks a declaratory judgment; monetary damages; liquidated damages; prejudgment interest; costs and a reasonable attorneys' fees, within

Page 1 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

the applicable statutory limitations period as a result of Defendants' commonly applied

policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated proper

minimum wages and overtime compensation under the FLSA and the AMWA.

4. The relevant time period of this Complaint is all of the time within the three

years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint until such time as judgment is

entered.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

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

this suit raises federal questions under the FLSA.

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

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

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

pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

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

against the named Plaintiff herein 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

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

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

Plaintiff Raymond Hatcher is a resident of Crittenden County. He was

employed by Defendants as a Construction Worker within the three (3) years preceding

the filing of this Original Complaint at Defendants' office located in West Memphis.

Page 2 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

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

protection and benefits provided under the Fair Labor Standards Act 29 U.S.C. § 201, et

seq.

12. Defendant Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., is an Arkansas for profit corporation

licensed to do business in the State of Arkansas, providing general contractor services.

13. Defendant Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc.'s annual gross volume of sales made

or business done was not less than \$500,000.00 (exclusive of exercise taxes at the retail

level that are separately stated) during each of the three calendar years preceding the

filing of this complaint.

14. During each of the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint,

Defendant Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., had at least two employees that handle, sell, or

otherwise work on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for interstate

commerce, including, but not limited to, building materials, construction supplies,

vehicles, hand tools, and other goods necessary to operate a general contractor service.

15. Defendant Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc.'s registered agent for service of

process is J.E. Scoggins, 6 Holmes Street, Newport, Arkansas 72112.

16. Defendant Edward Scoggins ("Scoggins") is a principal, director and/or

officer of Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc.

17. Upon information and belief, Defendant Scoggins controls or has the right

to control the day-to-day operations of Defendant Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., such that

he is liable to Plaintiff as an employer under the FLSA.

18. Defendant Scoggins established and/or maintained the policies at issue in

this case.

Page 3 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

19. Defendant Scoggins was at all times relevant hereto Plaintiff's employer and

is and has been engaged in interstate commerce as that term is defined under the FLSA.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

21. During the three (3) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Plaintiff worked

for Defendant as a construction worker.

22. As a construction worker, Plaintiff's primary duties were to construct

buildings.

23. In order to perform his duties as a construction worker, Plaintiff was required

to arrive at Defendants' office yard at the start of his shift in order to load tools into

Defendants' vehicles and meet other crew workers where they would travel to

construction sites in Defendants' vehicles.

24. Conversely, Plaintiff would be required to return to Defendants' office yard

after finishing work at Defendants' construction sites in order to return Defendants'

vehicles.

25. Plaintiff was classified as an hourly employee the entire duration of his

employment with Defendant.

26. It was Defendants' policy to not pay Plaintiff and other construction workers

for all the travel time required to return to Defendants' office yard.

27. Plaintiff and other construction workers worked more than forty (40) hours

per week on a regular, typical basis while working for Defendants.

Page 4 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

28. Plaintiff and the class performed their first compensable act at the yard all

or almost all days that they worked.

29. As a result, Plaintiff and other construction workers were deprived of regular

wages and overtime compensation for all of the hours over forty (40) per week.

30. Defendants knew or showed reckless disregard for whether the way it paid

Plaintiff and its other construction workers violated the FLSA.

V. REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

A. FLSA § 216(b) Classes

31. Plaintiff brings 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. Plaintiff brings his FLSA claims on behalf of all hourly workers who were

employed at Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., who were or will be employed by Defendants

at any time within the applicable statute of limitations period, who were classified by

Defendants as non-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 Defendants in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek; and

b. Liquidated damages and attorneys' fees.

33. In conformity with the requirements of FLSA Section 16(b), Plaintiff has

attached hereto as Exhibit "A" a written Consent to Join this lawsuit.

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

Plaintiff's Original Complaint—Collective and Class Action was filed herein and continues

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

Page 5 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-

Original Complaint—Collective Action

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

share these traits:

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

requirements of the FLSA:

b. They were paid hourly;

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

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

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

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

Hourly FLSA Class but believes that the class exceeds fifty (50) persons.

37. Defendants can readily identify the members of the Section 16(b) classes.

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

are available from Defendants, 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 as soon as possible,

together with other documents and information descriptive of Plaintiff's FLSA claim.

B. AMWA Rule 23 Classes

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

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

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

Procedure.

39. Plaintiff proposes to represent the class of hourly workers who are/were

employed by Defendants within the relevant time period within the State of Arkansas.

Page 6 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

Case 3:17-cv-00190-DPM Document 1 Filed 07/27/17 Page 7 of 14

40. Common guestions of law and fact relate to all members of the proposed

Hourly AMWA Class, such as whether Defendants paid the members of the proposed

class for all hours worked, including overtime in accordance with the AMWA.

41. Common questions of law and fact 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

proposed AMWA Class.

42. 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.

43. 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.

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

Defendant is based in the Western District of Arkansas and because Plaintiff and all

proposed class members work or worked with in Arkansas.

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

action.

46. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed classes in

that Plaintiff worked as an hourly employee for Defendants and experienced the same

violations of the AMWA that all other class members suffered.

47. Plaintiff and his counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the

class.

48. Plaintiff's counsel is 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.

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

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

individual members of the proposed class that would establish incompatible standards of

conduct for Defendants.

VI. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Individual Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

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

though fully incorporated in this section.

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

the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

52. At all relevant times, Defendants have been, and continue to be, Plaintiff's

"employer" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

53. At all relevant times, Defendants have been, and continue to be, an

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

Page 8 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

54. 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.

55. Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA.

56. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to minimum wage and overtime payments

under the FLSA, Defendants 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.

57. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed was willful.

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

VII. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Individual Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

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

though fully set forth herein.

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

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

61. At all relevant times, Defendants have been, and continue to be, Plaintiff's

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

Page 9 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

62. Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-210 and 211 require 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.

63. Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA and the AMWA.

64. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to minimum wage and overtime payments

under the AMWA, Defendants 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. Defendants willfully failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and the

members of the proposed class.

66. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendants are 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.

VIII. THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Collective Action Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

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

though fully set forth herein.

68. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, asserts

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

seq.

Page 10 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

69. At all relevant times, Defendants have been, and continue to be, an

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

U.S.C. § 203.

70. Defendants classified Plaintiff and all others similarly situated as non-

exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA.

71. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and those similarly situated to minimum

wage and overtime payments under the FLSA, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff 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.

72. Defendants willfully failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and to others

similarly situated.

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

members of the Section 216 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.

IX. FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Class Action Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

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

though fully set forth herein.

75. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed class,

asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the AMWA, Arkansas

Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 et seq.

Page 11 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

76. At all relevant times, Defendants have been, and continue to be, an

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

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

77. Defendants classified Plaintiff and the members of the proposed class as

non-exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and the AMWA.

78. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and the members of the proposed class

to minimum wage and overtime payments under the AMWA, Defendants failed to pay

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.

79. Defendants willfully failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and the

members of the proposed class.

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

Plaintiff and all members of the proposed 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.

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

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

prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Raymond Hatcher, individually on

behalf of all members of the proposed Section 216 and Rule 23 classes, respectfully prays as

follows:

Page 12 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

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

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

and class 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

Plaintiff and the proposed class members under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C.

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

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

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

regulations;

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

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

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

members during the applicable statutory period;

H. Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the Arkansas Minimum Wage

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

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

Page 13 of 14
Raymond Hatcher, et al v. Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., et al U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:17-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint—Collective Action

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

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HATCHER, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFF

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC One Financial Center 650 S. Shackleford Road, 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

**RAYMOND HATCHER, Individually and** on behalf of All Others Similarly Situated **PLAINTIFF** 

VS.

No. 3:17-cv-/90-DPM

FRANK A. ROGERS & CO., INC., and EDWARD SCOGGINS

**DEFENDANTS** 

### **CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION**

I was employed by Frank A. Rogers & Co., Inc., during some of the three years prior to the signing of this document. I understand that a lawsuit is being brought against my employer under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) for overtime compensation and other relief. As an employee of this defendant, I consent to becoming a partyplaintiff to 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.

July 25, 2017

RAYMOND HATCHER

c/o SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC

One Financial Center

650 South Shackleford, Suite 411 Little Rock, Arkansas 72211

TELEPHONE: (501) 221-0088

FACSIMILE: (888) 787-2040



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				
RAYMOND HATCHER, I	ndividually and on beh	alf of All Others Si	imilarly	FRANK A. ROGERS & CO., INC., and EDWARD SCOGGINS			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Crittenden				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)			
				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Josh Sanford, SANFORD	Iddress, and Telephone Number	) no Financial Conta		Attorneys (If Known)			
South Shackleford, Suite 501-221-0088; josh@san	411, Little Rock, Arkar		er, 650				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI		ne Roy Onhu	lm cr	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
				For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)	
U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citizer	of This State			
2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizer	of Another State	2		
				or Subject of a	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.							
CONTRACT						TEOTIDICATION NEWS	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury -		Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
☐ 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Product Liability		Other	28 USC 157	3729(a))	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability  320 Assault, Libel &	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical			<b>数認得ではまます。 は他のでは、 はいままれる。 はいままれる。 を表現しています。 をまます。 をままする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまする。 をまる。 をまる。 をまる。 をまる。 をまる。 をまる。 をまる。 をまる。 をまる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をもる。 をも。</b>	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment	,	Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copyrights	<ul> <li>430 Banks and Banking</li> </ul>	
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability	,		830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability  340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product	"		New Drug Application	470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability		CANADA AND NO. OF STREET, STRE	☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability  ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud		Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (1395ff)	480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 371 Truth in Lending		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
190 Other Contract	Product Liability  360 Other Personal	380 Other Personal		Labor/Management Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	Exchange  890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	Property Damage  385 Property Damage		Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts	
	☐ 362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability	751	Family and Medical		☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS 790	Leave Act Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Act Act	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:		Employee Retirement	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 896 Arbitration	
220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting	463 Alien Detainee	_	Income Security Act	or Defendant)	899 Administrative Procedure	
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	510 Motions to Vacat Sentence	ie		☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	☐ 530 General			}	☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	535 Death Penalty Other:		MMIGRATION  Naturalization Application		State Statutes	
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Otl		Other Immigration	Ì	i	
	Other	550 Civil Rights		Actions			
	☐ 448 Education	<ul><li>555 Prison Condition</li><li>560 Civil Detainee -</li></ul>					
		Conditions of	ŀ				
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" to		Confinement Remanded from	1 4 Reins	stated or	erred from	trict	
	ite Court	Appellate Court	Reop	ened Anothe (specify)	er District Litigation	n - Litigation -	
	29 U.S.C. 201 et		are filing (D	o not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless diversity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca	iuse:					
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:							
COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. JURY DEMAND: The Yes To No							
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
		SIGNATURE OF AT	TTOPAITY O	E DECORD A	LOCKET NOWIDER _	4,7	
DATE 07/07/0017		SIGNATURE OF A	LIORNETO	r record X	MH)		
07/27/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		-		<del>(?)</del>	<del>* / </del>		
	ALOUBIT	A DDI VIDIC IED		HIDGE	MAG III	IDCE	

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Lawsuit: Construction Company Deprives Workers of Travel Time Pay</u>