## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

KEGAN REICHERT, on behalf of himself and those similarly situated,

CASE NO.:

Plaintiff,

vs.

HOOVER FOODS, INC., a Georgia Corporation,

Defendant.

### COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, KEGAN REICHERT, by and through the undersigned attorney, sues the Defendant, HOOVER FOODS, INC., a Georgia Corporation, and alleges:

1. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated assistant managers who worked for Defendant at their Wendy's locations throughout the Southeastern United States. For years Defendant has classified these employees as exempt from overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) ("FLSA") and paid them no extra overtime compensation for the numerous overtime hours worked

by them. As further explained below, Defendant categorically misclassified these employees as exempt when they should have been classified as non-exempt employees. As such, Plaintiff and these similarly situated employees are entitled to years' worth of overtime compensation, liquidated damages, and other relief under the FLSA.

#### GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 2. Plaintiff worked for Defendant from approximately January 2015 to 2016 as an assistant manager.
- 3. Plaintiff worked for Defendant at its Wendy's location in Alpharetta, Georgia.
- 4. Defendant is a Georgia Corporation that operates numerous Wendy's franchises throughout the Southeastern United States, including in Fulton County, Georgia and is therefore, within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 5. Based on information and belief, Defendant at times establishes a new corporate subsidiary name for a Wendy's location it operates.
- 6. However, all human resources, central accounting and other central functions are operated by Defendant out of its headquarters in the greater Atlanta area.
  - 7. Defendant employed all assistant managers, including Plaintiff, at

each of its subsidiaries which operated a Wendy's under Defendant's purview.

- 8. This action is brought under the FLSA to recover from Defendant overtime compensation, liquidated damages, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. This action is intended to include each and every assistant manager who was classified as exempt and who worked for Defendant at any time within the past three (3) years.
- 9. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and the FLSA and the authority to grant declaratory relief under the FLSA pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201 et seq.
- 10. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Defendant earned more than \$500,000.00 per year in gross sales.
- 11. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Defendant employed two or more employees which handled goods, materials and supplies which had travelled in interstate commerce.
- 12. Included in such goods, materials and supplies were computers, cash registers, telephones, restaurant equipment, marketing materials, food, drink, office equipment and furniture, as well as numerous other goods, materials and supplies which had been carried in interstate commerce.
  - 13. Therefore, Defendant is considered an enterprise covered by the

FLSA, and as defined by 29 U.S.C. §203(r) and 203(s).

#### FLSA VIOLATIONS

- 14. At all times relevant to this action, Defendant failed to comply with the FLSA by misclassifying Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees as exempt from overtime.
- 15. During their employment with Defendant, these employees, including Plaintiff, worked numerous overtime hours for Defendant.
- 16. Even though Plaintiff and these similarly situated employees worked overtime hours, they were not paid any additional compensation in addition to their weekly salary by Defendant.
- 17. However, these employees should not have been classified as exempt for several reasons.
- 18. First, even though these employees were called "managers," they had no ability to hire or fire employees, were not involved in interviewing or other aspects of firing/hiring.
- 19. Additionally, Defendant failed to pay its assistant managers on a salary basis because Defendant had no sick policy available for its employees and would dock their pay for any such absences. See 29 C.F.R. § 541.602(b)(2).

4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Under the FLSA, job titles are insufficient to establish whether an employee is exempt or not. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 541.2.

- 20. As such, Defendant cannot meet its burden to prove that these employees are exempt from overtime compensation under the FLSA.
- 21. The additional persons who may become plaintiffs in this action are employees who held positions similarly to Plaintiff and who worked in excess of forty (40) hours during one or more work weeks during the relevant time periods but who did not receive pay at one and one-half times their regular rate for their hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours.
- 22. Upon information and belief, the records, to the extent any exist and are accurate, concerning the number of hours worked and amounts paid to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees are in the possession and custody of Defendant.

#### RECOVERY OF OVERTIME COMPENSATION

- 23. Plaintiff reincorporates and readopts all allegations contained within Paragraphs 1-22 above.
- 24. During their employment with Defendant, Plaintiff and those similarly situated employees worked overtime hours but did not receive overtime compensation for such hours worked.
- 25. Plaintiff and those similarly situated employees were misclassified as exempt employees by Defendant.  $See \P\P 14-20$ .

- 26. Defendant did not have a good faith basis for its decision to classify Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees as exempt from overtime compensation.
- 27. As a result of Defendant's intentional, willful and unlawful acts in refusing to pay Plaintiff and those similarly situated employees overtime compensation, Plaintiff and those similarly situated employees have suffered damages plus incurring reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
- 28. As a result of Defendant's willful violation of the FLSA, Plaintiff and those similarly situated employees are entitled to liquidated damages.
  - 29. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, KEGAN REICHERT, on behalf of himself and those similarly situated, demands judgment against Defendant for unpaid overtime compensation the payment of all overtime hours at one and one-half the regular rate of pay for the hours worked by them for which Defendant did not properly compensate them, liquidated damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action, declaratory relief, and any and all further relief that this Court determines to be just and appropriate.

Dated this 13th day of December, 2016.

# /s/ C. RYAN MORGAN\_

C. Ryan Morgan, Esq. Georgia Bar No. 711884 Morgan & Morgan, P.A. 20 N. Orange Ave., 14<sup>th</sup> Floor Orlando, FL 32802-4979

Telephone: (407) 420-1414 Facsimile: (407) 245-3401

Email: RMorgan@forthepeople.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

KEGAN REICHERT, on behalf of himself and those similarly situated,

Plaintiff,	CASE NO.:
vs.	
HOOVER FOODS, INC., a Georgia Corporation,	

Defendant.

#### NOTICE OF FILING NOTICE OF CONSENT TO JOIN

Plaintiff, KEGAN REICHERT, on behalf of himself and those similarly situated, gives notice of filing the attached Notice of Consent to Join.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing Notice of Filing Notice of Consent to Join has been served along with the Summons and a copy of the Complaint.

#### /s/ C. RYAN MORGAN

C. Ryan Morgan, Esquire Georgia Bar No.: 711884 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A. 20 N. Orange Avenue Suite 1600 Orlando, FL 32801 Telephone: (407) 420-1414 Facsimile: (407) 245-3401

E-mail: RMorgan@forthepeople.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICTOF CEORGIA CASE NO.:

Kegan Reichert
Individually, and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

Hoover Foods, Inc.

#### CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION AND BE REPRESENTED BY MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.®

- I <u>legan Vausha Feicher</u>, consent to join the above styled lawsuit seeking damages for annaid wages under the FLSA;
- I am similarly situated to the named Plaintiff in this matter because I performed similar duties for the Defendant and was paid in the same regard as the named Plaintiff;
- I authorized the named Plaintiff to file and prosecute the above referenced matter in my name, and on my behalf, and designate the named Plaintiff to make decisions on my behalf concerning the litigation, including negotiating a resolution of my claims;
- I agree to be represented by Morgan & Morgan, P.A.®, counsel for the named Plaintiff;
- In the event this action gets conditionally certified and then decertified, I authorize Plaintiff's counsel to reuse this Consent Form to re-file my claims in a separate or related action against Defendant.

silê.

Date:

Signature:

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

# **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.)

purpose of initiating the errir of	ocker sheet: (BEE MSTREE										
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS KEGAN REICHERT, on behalf of himself and those similarly situa			ted,	DEFENDANTS HOOVER FOODS, INC., a Georgia Corporation,							
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Forsyth  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)  (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			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.								
			Attorneys (If Known)								
Morgan & Morgan, P.A., Florida 32801; Telephone		nue, Suite 1400, Or	lando,								
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				TIZENSHIP OF P. (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in ( and One Box fo				
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	★ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			P	rf def 1 □ 1	Incorporated or Prin	ncipal Place	PTF  4	DEF		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity     (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citiz	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and Proof Business In A		<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>		
					Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country						
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	$\Gamma$ (Place an "X" in One Box Or	nly)		ORFEITURE/PENALTY			OTHERS				
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability  320 Assault, Libel & Slander  330 Federal Employers' Liability  340 Marine  345 Marine Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability  360 Other Personal Injury  362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice  CIVIL RIGHTS  440 Other Civil Rights  441 Voting  442 Employment  443 Housing/	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPEI  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIO  Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	0 69 1 2 77 2 72 0 74 0 75	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 20 Other  LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	422 Appeal 28 USC 158     423 Withdrawal		□ 375 False Claims Act □ 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 □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes				
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property  V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is	Accommodations  Accommodations  At 5 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment  446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other  448 Education	□ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty Other: □ 540 Mandamus & Oth □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition □ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions							
X 1 Original □ 2 Re		Remanded from Appellate Court	□ 4 Rein Reo <sub>l</sub>		r District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation	ct				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	IU.S.C. Section 21	6(b)	re filing (1	Do not cite jurisdictional stat	utes unless di	versity):					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$		HECK YES only i	if demanded in	complair	nt:		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER					
DATE 12/13/2016	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD  /s/ C. Ryan Morgan										
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	<del></del>										
	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: <u>Hoover Foods Flame-Broiled with Unpaid Overtime Suit</u>