FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

2010 NOY -5 PM 12: 34

CLEAK, US DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE EIGIRIST OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT

JONATHAN JOHNSON, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO.: 318-W-1314-J-2013

WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC.,

Defendant.		
		- /

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, JONATHAN JOHNSON ("Plaintiff"), by and through undersigned counsel, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action against Defendant, WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. ("Defendant"), and in support of his claims states as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This is an action for damages under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq., for failure to pay overtime wages under 29 U.S.C. § 215(a)(3). This Complaint is filed as a collective action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29
 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.
- 3. Venue is proper in the Middle District of Florida, because all of the events giving rise to these claims occurred in Duval County, Florida.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff is a resident of Duval County, Florida.
- 5. Defendant WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. operates a molding and millwork manufacturer in Lawrenceville, in Gwinnett County, Georgia.
- 6. Defendant is registered to conduct business in Florida and operates, conducts, engages in and carries on a business venture in this state.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. Plaintiff has satisfied all conditions precedent, or they have been waived.
- 8. Plaintiff has hired the undersigned attorneys and agreed to pay them a fee.
- 9. Plaintiff requests a jury trial for all issues so triable.
- 10. At all times material hereto, Named Plaintiff JONATHAN JOHNSON was employed by Defendant as a field service representative.
- 11. The putative class of similarly situated employees consists of all other field service representatives employed by Defendant within the last three years. These similarly situated persons will be referred to as "Members of the Class" or "the Class."
- 12. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff and Members of the Class were "engaged in the production of goods" for commerce within the meaning of Sections 6 and 7 of the FLSA, and as such were subject to the individual coverage of the FLSA.
- 13. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff and Members of the Class were "employees" of Defendant WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. within the meaning of the FLSA.

- 14. At all times material hereto, Defendant WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. was an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 15. Defendant WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. continues to be an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 16. At all times material hereto, Defendant WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. was and continues to be an enterprise covered by the FLSA, as defined under 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(r) and 203(s).
- 17. At all times relevant to this action, Defendant WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s).
- 18. At all times relevant to this action, the annual gross sales volume of Defendant WOODGRAIN MILLWORK, INC. exceeded \$500,000 per year.
- 19. Specifically, Plaintiff and the Class were not employed by Defendant in a bona fide administrative, executive, or professional capacity. In particular, Plaintiff and Members of the Class had no authority to hire or terminate any other employee of Defendant; they had no special or professional qualifications and skills for the explicit use of which they were employed by Defendant; and they had no control whatsoever over Defendant's business operations, even from an administrative standpoint. Further, Plaintiff and the Class did not agree to a fluctuating work week and even if so, Defendant's payroll practices were in violation of fluctuating workweek requirements.
- 20. Thus, Plaintiff and Members of the Class are "non-exempt employees" who are covered by the FLSA.

21. At all times material hereto, the work performed by Plaintiff and Members of the Class was directly essential to the business performed by Defendant.

FACTS

- 22. Named Plaintiff JONATHAN JOHNSON began working for Defendant as a field service representative in June 2017.
- 23. At various times material hereto, Plaintiff and the Class worked hours in excess of forty (40) hours within a work week for Defendant, and they were entitled to be compensated for these overtime hours at a rate equal to one and one-half times their individual regular hourly rates.
- 24. Defendant knew of the overtime requirements of the FLSA and intentionally failed to investigate whether their payroll practices were in accordance with the FLSA.
- 25. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Members of the Class the overtime premium of one and one half times their individual regular hourly rates for all of the overtime hours that they worked, in violation of the FLSA.
- 26. By failing to accurately record, report, and/or preserve records of hours worked by Plaintiff and Members of the Class, Defendant has failed to make, keep, and preserve records with respect to each of its employees in a manner sufficient to determine their wages, hours, and other conditions of employment, including Defendant's employment practices, in violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.
- 27. Defendant's actions were willful, and showed reckless disregard for the provisions of the FLSA.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 28. Plaintiff brings this case as an "opt-in" collective action on behalf of similarly situated employees of Defendant (the "Class") pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). The Class is composed of field service representatives whom Defendant failed to compensate for all overtime hours worked in accordance with the FLSA.
- 29. Therefore, Notice is properly sent to: "All field service representatives whom Defendant failed to compensate for all of the overtime hours that they worked from 2015 to the present."
- 30. The total number and identities of the Class members may be determined from the records of Defendant, and the Class may easily and quickly be notified of the pendency of this action.
- 31. Plaintiff is similar to the Class because he and the Class have been unlawfully denied full payment of their overtime wages as mandated by the FLSA.
- 32. Plaintiff's experience with Defendant's payroll practices is typical of the experiences of the Class.
- 33. Defendant's failure to pay all overtime wages due at the rates required by the personal circumstances of the named Plaintiff or of the Class is common to the Class.
- 34. Overall, Plaintiff's experience as a field service representative who worked for Defendant is typical of that of the Class.
- 35. Specific job titles or job duties of the Class do not prevent collective treatment.

36. Although the issues of damages can be individual in character, there remains a common nucleus of operative facts concerning Defendant's liability under the FLSA in this case.

COUNT I – FLSA OVERTIME VIOLATIONS

- 37. Plaintiff realleges and readopts the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 36 of this Complaint, as fully set forth herein. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated employees in accordance with 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Plaintiff anticipates that as this case proceeds, other individuals will sign consent forms and join this collective action as plaintiffs.
- 38. During the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Class worked overtime hours while employed by Defendant, and they were not properly compensated for all of these hours under the FLSA.
- 39. Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Class for all of the overtime hours that Plaintiff and the Class worked in excess of forty (40) hours worked.
- 40. The Members of the Class are similarly situated because they were all employed as field service representatives by Defendant, were compensated in the same manner, and were all subject to Defendant's common policy and practice of failing to pay its field service representatives for all of the overtime hours that they worked in accordance with the FLSA.
- 41. This reckless practice violates the provisions of the FLSA, specifically 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1). As a result, Plaintiff and the Members of the Class who have opted

into this action are each entitled to an amount equal to their unpaid overtime wages as liquidated damages.

- 42. All of the foregoing conduct, as alleged, constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).
 - 43. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered damages.

 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and all similarly situated employees who join this collective action demand:
 - (a) Designation of this action as a collective action on behalf of the Plaintiff and the prospective Class that he seeks to represent, in accordance with the FLSA;
 - (b) Prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated members of the FLSA putative class, apprising them of the pendency of this action and permitting them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual consent to sue forms pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
 - (c) Equitable tolling of the statute of limitations from the date of the filing of this complaint until the expiration of the deadline for filing consent to sue forms under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
 - (d) Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by this Court;

- (e) Judgment against Defendant for an amount equal to the unpaid overtime wages of Plaintiff and of opt-in Members of the Class at the applicable overtime rate;
- (f) A declaratory judgment stating that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the FLSA;
- (g) Judgment against Defendant for an amount equal to the unpaid back wages of Plaintiff and of opt-in Members of the Class at the applicable overtime rate as liquidated damages;
- (h) Judgment against Defendant, stating that its violations of the FLSA were willful;
- To the extent liquidated damages are not awarded, an award of prejudgment interest;
- (j) All costs and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting these claims;and
- (k) For such further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff demands trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

Dated this 5th day of November, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

DONNA V. SMITH

Florida Bar Number: 661201 WENZEL FENTON CABASSA, P.A.

1110 North Florida Avenue

Suite 300

Tampa, Florida 33602

Main Number: 813-224-0431 Direct Dial: 813-386-0995 Facsimile: 813-229-8712 Email: dsmith@wfclaw.com Email: rcooke@wfclaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff JS 44 (Rev. 11/15)

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. ISEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS JONATHAN JOHNSON, similarly situated,				DEFENDANT WOODGRAIN M	`S IILLWORK,	INC.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Duval (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Duval (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 DONNA V. SMITH, WEN Florida Avenue, Suite 30 813-224-0431, Direct Dia	0, Tampa, Florida 330			Attorneys (If Know)	n)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box (Inly)				AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)			PTF DEF	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	1 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh.)	p of Parties in Item III)			O 2 O 2	of Business In A		
				reign Country		· Oreign · vanon		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			essa lesso	DRFEITUREMENALTY	an kasaman PA	NKRUPTCY	THE COTHERS TATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product	D 69	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	☐ 422 App ☐ 423 With 28 U	eal 28 USC 158 adrawal USC 157 REYRIGHTS are sprights nt	375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 896 Arbitration 897 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	
(Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	□ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Liability PERSONAL PROPE 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	O 72	O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Management Relations O Railway Labor Act I Family and Medical Leave Act O Other Labor Litigation	☐ 861 HIA ☐ 862 Blac	k Lung (923) /C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI		
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	d40 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 42 Employment 43 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee	INSE 0 7	I Employee Retirement Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxe or D ☐ 871 IRS-	RALTAX SUTTS tes (U.S. Plaintiff Defendant) 5—Third Party USC 7609		
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment		ner	// IMMIGRATION 22 Naturalization Applicati 5 Other Immigration Actions	on		State Statutes	
	n One Box Only) moved from	Remanded from Appellate Court			sferred from ther District	6 Multidistr Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Str FLSA 29 U.S.C. Brief description of ca FLSA violations		re filing (4 .S.C. §	Do not cite Jurisdictional s 216(b)		iversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTIO 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND S		CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE	TOP NOT	OF RECORD	DOCK	ET NUMBER	2-2-3-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-4-	
DATE 11/05/2018		SIGNATURE OF AT		A KELUKD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #AM	MOUNT & U OO	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	20	MAG. JU	DGE PDB	
DOS 02148	3		•		-		-	

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Woodgrain Millwork Facing Employee's Unpaid Overtime Lawsuit