UNITED STATES DISRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY LOUISVILLE DIVISION

CASSANDRA JONES, individually & on behalf of all similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s),	Case Numbe	3:17-CV-411-DJH
v.	Case Number	<u> </u>
GOOD SHEPHERD HEALTHCARE SOLUTIONS, INC.		
Defendant.		

Complaint & Jury Demand

- 1. The named Plaintiff, Cassandra Jones, on her own behalf and on behalf of all similarly situated, sues the Defendant, Good Shepherd Healthcare Solutions, Inc. pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) for unpaid overtime in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207(a).
 - 2. Named Plaintiff resides in Louisville, Kentucky.
 - 3. Defendant is a Kentucky corporation that operates for profit.
- 4. Defendant operates under the assumed name corporation BrightStar of Kentucky.
 - 5. Defendant is a franchisee of BrightStar Care.
 - 6. Defendant is in the business of home care.
- 7. The Home Care industry has sought to work low wage employees overtime without overtime pay.

- 8. In 2015 the U.S. Department of Labor brought the Home Care industry practice of working workers overtime without proper pay to an end.
- 9. At least, in 2015 aggrieved employees of this industry were afforded the right to seek redress pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act.
- 10. Defendant has employed in excess of 100 home care workers in Kentucky since 2015.
 - 11. Defendant has annual gross revenues in excess of \$500,000.00.
- 12. Defendant employs employees that handle goods or materials that have moved in interstate commerce such as computers, paper, pen, medicines, home cleaning supplies, vehicles and medical equipment.
 - 13. Defendant is an enterprise as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).
- Defendant is an enterprise engaged in commerce as defined by 29
 U.S.C. § 203(s).
 - 15. Defendant was Plaintiff(s)' employer as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
 - 16. Plaintiff(s) worked for Defendant.
- 17. Plaintiff(s) would go to the homes of Defendant's clients and help them with their needs, including cleaning and cooking for these medical patients.
 - 18. Plaintiff(s) regularly worked over forty hours a week.
 - 19. In fact, Plaintiff(s) worked over 90 hours in some weeks.
 - 20. Named Plaintiff was not a unique employee for Defendant.
- 21. Defendant employed dozens of employees similarly situated to the named Plaintiff.

- 22. These employees had similar job duties.
- 23. They would take care of the day to day needs of medical patients that were clients of Defendant at their homes.
- 24. Defendant paid this class of employees, herein referred to as home healthcare aides, in the same manner.
- 25. Prior to 2015 Defendant was not concerned with the overtime provision of the FLSA.
- 26. In 2015 Defendant implemented a scheme to evade the payment of overtime.
- 27. Defendant's home healthcare aides were paid a predetermined hourly rate for all hours they worked regardless of whether those hours were under 40 or over 40.
- 28. Defendant contracted with ADP to issue paychecks to its home healthcare aides, the Plaintiff(s), on a weekly basis.
- 29. Defendant provided misleading information to ADP regarding Plaintiff(s).
- 30. On paychecks Defendant suggests that Plaintiff(s) were paid a different hourly rate each week for forty hours and something for overtime (it is "something" because there is no correlation between regular pay and overtime pay on the paychecks).

- 31. Significantly the sum hours of "regular" and "overtime" earnings multiplied by a constant hourly rate results in Plaintiff(s)' gross pay on the paychecks.
- 32. If "other" and "holiday" earnings are listed they would have to be added to the gross sum of "regular" and "overtime" earnings to obtain the gross pay on the paychecks.
 - 33. The named Plaintiff was paid \$10.00 per hour.
- 34. The named Plaintiff was paid this monetary amount for all hours worked regardless of whether the hours were under forty or over forty.
 - 35. Defendant paid all Plaintiff(s) in the same manner.
- 36. Some Plaintiff(s) may have earned different hourly rates, but none were paid 150% of their regular rate of pay for overtime.
- 37. Defendant's policy was to pay the same hourly rate for all hours worked.
- 38. Defendant explained this to Plaintiff(s) by stating that their clients did not want to pay overtime.
- 39. In other words Defendant flouted the Fair Labor Standards Act after the U.S. Department of Labor made clear that Plaintiff(s) were entitled to overtime pay.
 - 40. Defendant willfully violated the FLSA.

- 41. Plaintiff(s) consist of any of Defendant's employees that have worked over forty hours or more after the 2015 rule change without receiving time and half their regular rate of pay.
 - 42. Defendant owes named Plaintiff unpaid overtime.
- 43. Defendant owes all of its home health aides unpaid overtime for the same reason that it owes unpaid overtime to the named Plaintiff.
- 44. The named Plaintiff consents to represent all similarly situated employees to recover unpaid overtime from Defendant since the 2015 rule change.
- 45. The Honorable Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 46. Venue is appropriate in Louisville, Kentucky because Defendant is headquartered in the city and some of the violations occurred in Jefferson County, Kentucky.

Wherefore, named Plaintiff demands trial by jury, facilitation of notice, final class certification, unpaid overtime, liquidated damages, judgment, attorneys' fees, costs and a declaration that Defendant's practice of disguising its pay on paychecks tolls the statute of limitations for all impacted employees.

Respectfully submitted this 11th day of July 2017,

/s/ Bernard R. Mazaheri

Bernard R. Mazaheri Morgan & Morgan 333 W Vine St Ste 1200 Lexington, Kentucky 40507 Tel – (859)286-8368 Email – bmazaheri@forthepeople.com 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 de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	PRM.)						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS						
Cassandra Jones, individually and on behalf of all similarly situated, (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Jefferson (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			d,	Good Shepherd Healthcare Solutions, Inc.						
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Morgan & Morgan, 333 V 286-8368	Address, and Telephone Numbe V Vine St Ste 1200, Le	_{r)} exington, KY 40507	; (859)	Attorneys (If Known)						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES				
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	★ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State	and One Box for ncipal Place his State	or Defenda PTF 4	ant) DEF			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and P. of Business In A		□ 5	□ 5	
				en or Subject of a reign Country		Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			l FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		here for: Nature o				
CONTRACT ☐ 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 Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other: 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition of Confinement	X	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 26 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 20 Railway Labor Act 21 Family and Medical Leave Act 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 22 Naturalization Application 25 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appea □ 423 Withd 28 US PROPER □ 820 Copyi □ 830 Pateni □ 840 Trade SOCIAL □ 861 HIA (□ 862 Black □ 863 DIWC □ 865 RSI (4 FEDERA □ 870 Taxes or De □ 871 IRS— 26 US	SC 157 CTY RIGHTS rights Abbreviated Drug Application mark SECURITY 1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) L TAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff fendant)	OTHER STATUTES □ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC		ment ng ced and ions dities/ ctions tters nation ocedure peal of	
	moved from	Appellate Court	•	pened Anothe (specify)	r District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer	-	Multidis Litigatic Direct Fi	on -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	129 U.S.C. Sec. 21	16(b)	re filing (1	Do not cite jurisdictional stat	utes unless div	ersity):				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	TED IN			CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ▼ Yes □ No						
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	Γ NUMBER				
DATE 07/11/2017		signature of at /s/ Bernard R. I								
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AN	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: KY Resident Claims Good Shepherd Healthcare Solutions Owes Unpaid OT