FILED

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FORT MYERS DIVISION

2017 MAR 14 AM 11: 19

CLERK, US DISTRICT COURT NIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FORT MYERS FLORIDA

GANEL POUDY, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO .: 2.17-61-148-FHM-99CM

vs.

TEXAS ROADHOUSE OF FORT MYERS, FL, LLC, a Foreign Profit Corporation.

Defendant.

1

#### <u>COMPLAINT</u>

COMES NOW Plaintiff. GANEL POUDY. (hereinafter "Plaintiff") on behalf of himself, other employees and former employees similarly situated, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this Complaint against Defendant. TEXAS ROADHOUSE OF FORT MYERS, FL, LLC doing business as Texas Roadhouse (hereinafter "Defendant" or "TEXAS ROADHOUSE") and states as follows:

#### **JURISDICTION**

1. Jurisdiction in this Court is proper as the claims are brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, (29 U.S.C. §201, et seq., hereinafter called the "FLSA") to recover unpaid minimum and overtime wages, an equal amount of liquidated damages and reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

The jurisdiction of the Court over this controversy is based upon 29 U.S.C.
 §216(b).

1

#### PARTIES

3. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff, GANEL POUDY, is and was a resident of Lee County, Florida.

4. At all times material hereto, TEXAS ROADHOUSE was and continues to be a Foreign Profit Corporation. Further, at all times material hereto, TEXAS ROADHOUSE was, and continues to be, engaged in business in Florida, with a principle place of business in Lee County, Florida.

5. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was "engaged in commerce" within the meaning of §206 of the FLSA.

6. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was an "employee" of the Defendant within the meaning of FLSA.

7. At all times material hereto, Defendant was the "employer" within the meaning of FLSA.

8. Defendant was and continues to be an "employer" within the meaning of FLSA.

9. At all times material hereto, Defendant TEXAS ROADHOUSE was and continues to be "enterprises engaged in commerce" within the meaning of FLSA.

10. At all times material hereto, Defendant TEXAS ROADHOUSE was and continues to be an enterprises engaged in the "production of goods for commerce" within the meaning of FLSA.

11. Based upon information and belief, the annual gross revenue of Defendant TEXAS ROADHOUSE is in excess of \$500,000.00 per annum during the relevant time periods.

2

, 2

12. At all times material hereto, Defendant has two (2) or more employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that had been moved in or produced for commerce.

13. At all times material hereto, the Plaintiff was "engaged in commerce" and subject to individual coverage of the FLSA.

14. At all times material hereto, the Plaintiff was engaged in the "production of goods for commerce" and subject to individual coverage of the FLSA.

15. The additional persons who may become Plaintiffs in this action are/were "server" employees of Defendant, who held similar positions to Plaintiff and who, (1) did not earn minimum wages for each hour worked; and/or (2) performed work off the clock.

16. At all times material hereto, the work performed by Plaintiff was directly essential to the business performed by Defendant.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

17. From on or about July 24, 2014 until January 12, 2017, Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a non-exempt "prep cook."

18. Defendant has violated Title 29 U.S.C. §206 from at least July 24, 2014, and continuing through January 12, 2017 in that Plaintiff was not compensated for all hours worked.

19. At various material times hereto (2014-2017), Plaintiff worked off the clock and was not paid for all hours worked.

20. At various material times hereto (2014-2017), Plaintiff was not paid minimum wage for each hour worked.

3

. . \*

21. From at least July 24, 2014, and continuing through January 12, 2017, Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff for all hours worked as required by the FLSA.

22. Defendant has failed to maintain proper time records as mandated by the FLSA.

23. Plaintiff has retained the BERKE LAW FIRM, P.A. to represent him in the litigation and has agreed to pay the firm a reasonable fee for its services.

### COUNT I VIOLATION OF 29 U.S.C. §206 MINIMUM WAGES

24. Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 23 of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

25. From July 24, 2014, and continuing through January 12, 2017 Plaintiff performed work off the clock was not compensated at least minimum wages for every hour worked.

26. Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, was entitled to be paid minimum wages for each hour worked during his employment with Defendant.

27. Since then, Plaintiff has demanded compensation for all hours worked, but Defendant has refused and/or failed to compensate him for same. As a result of Defendant's actions in this regard, Plaintiff has not been paid the minimum wages for each hour worked during multiple weeks of employment with Defendant.

28. Due to intentional, willful, and unlawful acts of Defendant, Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, suffered and continues to suffer damages and lost compensation for minimum wages for multiple weeks of work contrary to 29 U.S.C. §206.

29. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b).

4

• \*

30. At all times material hereto, Defendant failed to comply with Title 29 and United States Department of Regulations, 29 C.F.R. §§516.2 and 516.4, with respect to those similarly situated to the named Plaintiff by virtue of the management policy, plan or decision that intentionally provided for payment of minimum wages.

31. Based upon information and belief, the employees and former employees of Defendant similarly situated to Plaintiff were not paid proper overtime for hours worked in excess of forty (40) in one or more workweeks because Defendant failed to properly pay Plaintiff minimum wages for every hour worked.

32. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's deliberate underpayment of wages, Plaintiff has been damaged in the loss of minimum wages for one or more weeks of work with Defendant.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, GANEL POUDY, on behalf of himself and all proposed members of the FLSA representative action pray for relief as follows:

- a. Declaring, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§2201 and 2202, that the acts and practices complained of herein are in violation of the minimum wage provisions of the FLSA;
- Awarding Plaintiff the loss of minimum wages in the amount due for time worked;
- Awarding Plaintiff liquidated damages in an amount equal to the loss of minimum wages award;
- d. Awarding Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs and expenses of the litigation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b);
- e. Awarding Plaintiff pre-judgment interest; and

f. Issue an Order, as soon as is practicable, authorizing Plaintiff to send notice of the instant lawsuit to all similarly situated nonexempt employees employed by Defendant within the past three years.

Respectfully submitted this 13th day of March 2017.

6 . . . .

## BERKE LAW FIRM, P.A.

By: <u>/s/ Bill B. Berke</u> Bill B. Berke, Esq. Florida Bar No. 0558011 berkelaw@yahoo.com 4423 Del Prado Boulevard S. Cape Coral, FL 33904 Telephone: (239) 549-6689 *Attorney for Plaintiff*  JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

FILED

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 Ganel Poudy, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Lee (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				DEFENDANTS TEXAS ROADHOUSE OF FORT MYERS, MARLICL & APPLIN Profit Corporation, County of Residence of First Listed Defended II + DISTRICT COURT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE OF TAY ERS FLORIDA (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE OF TAY ERS FLORIDA NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
									(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, . Bill B. Berke, Esq., BERK Cape Coral, Florida 3390
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place on "X" in (	he Box Only)	III. CI	<b>FIZENSHIP OF P</b>	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place on "X" in G	)ne Box for Plaintiff	
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State 0 1 0 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 0 4 0 4 of Business In This State					
2 U.S. Government Defendant				Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 of Business In Another State					
				n or Subject of a C cign Country	<b></b>	Foreign Nation		<u> </u>	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		aliy DRANS	<b>In the second second</b>	REFUREPENALITY	-	KRUPERGY	0711228	W.VETERAS	
<ul> <li>110 Insurance</li> <li>120 Marine</li> <li>130 Miller Act</li> <li>140 Negotiable Instrument</li> <li>150 Recovery of Overpayment &amp; Enforcement of Judgment</li> <li>151 Medicare Act</li> <li>152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)</li> <li>153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits</li> <li>160 Stockholders' Suits</li> <li>190 Other Contract</li> <li>195 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>196 Franchise</li> </ul>	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability <b>EPRISONER/FETTIO</b> Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacato Sentence	I     I     62:       I     69:       I     71:       I     72:       I     74:       I     79:       I     79:	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other Definition of the seizer of Fair Labor Standards Act D Labor/Management Relations D Rail Way Labor Act 1 Labor/Management Relations D Rail Way Labor Act 1 Labor/Management I Relations D Rail Way Labor Act 1 Labor/Management I Leave Act D Other Labor Litigation I Employee Retirement Income Security Act MMMIGRAVION Network Security Act Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	Image: Contract of the second seco	al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 trights trig trights trights t	<ul> <li>375 False Cla</li> <li>400 State Rea</li> <li>410 Antitrust</li> <li>430 Banka an</li> <li>450 Conumerni</li> <li>460 Deportation</li> <li>470 Racketee Corrupt C</li> <li>480 Consumeric</li> <li>480 Consumeric</li> <li>490 Cable/Sa</li> <li>850 Securitie</li> <li>893 Exviroun</li> <li>893 Enviroun</li> <li>895 Freedom Act</li> <li>899 Administ</li> </ul>	aims Act apportionment id Banking ce ion er Influenced and Organizations er Credit it TV scCommodities/ ge atutory Actions ural Acts nental Matters of Information on trative Procedure etw or Appeal of Decision tiouslity of	
	n (Ine Bax (Inly) moved from 🛛 3 ite Court	Remanded from ( Appellate Court	I 4 Reins Reop		er District	6 Multidistri Litigation	ict		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Fair Labor Stands	atute under which you a ards Act, as amend ause:			itutes unless di	versity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.CV.P			N DI	EMAND S CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND:					
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E <b>(S)</b> (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 03/13/2017		signature of at /s/ Bill B. Berke		FRECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # IFP A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI			
			Зʻl	700-148	-FEM	-99CN	Λ		

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Texas Roadhouse of Fort Myers Hit with Unpaid Overtime Lawsuit</u>