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



OCT 04 2018

JAMES W. McCORMACK, CLERK
By: DEP CLERK
PLAINTIFF

ROBERT SARRELS, Individually and on Behalf of Others Similarly Situated

vs.

No. 3:18-cv- 187- BSM

THE LILLY COMPANY

DEFENDANT

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—COLLECTIVE ACTION

COMES NOW Plaintiff Robert Sarrels, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys Steve Rauls and Josh Sanford of Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and for his Original Complaint—Collective Action against Defendant The Lilly Company ("Defendant"), does hereby state and allege as follows:

This case assigned to District Judge Miller

I. and to Magistrate Judge Harris

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. ("FLSA"), and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. ("AMWA"), for declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees as a result of Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated

Page 1 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-____
Original Complaint—Collective Action

overtime compensation for all hours that Plaintiff and all others similarly situated worked in excess of forty (40) per workweek.

2. Upon information and belief, for at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant has willfully and intentionally committed violations of the FLSA and AMWA as described *infra*.

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 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.
- 4. This Complaint also alleges violations of the AMWA, which arise out of the same set of operative facts as the federal cause of action herein alleged; accordingly, this state cause of action would be expected to be tried with the federal claim in a single judicial proceeding.
- 5. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
- 6. Defendant conducts business within the State of Arkansas, operating a warehouse in Jonesboro.
- 7. Venue lies properly within this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (c)(2), because the State of Arkansas has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and Defendant therefore "resides" in Arkansas.
- 8. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant at its facilities located on Jonesboro, Arkansas. Therefore, the acts alleged in this Complaint had their

Page 2 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-____
Original Complaint—Collective Action

principal effect within the Jonesboro Division of the Eastern District of Arkansas, and venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

III.

THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff Robert Sarrels is a resident and citizen of Craighead
 County.
- 10. At all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, Plaintiff was a salaried employee at Defendant's warehouse in Jonesboro.
- 11. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and those similarly situated to Plaintiff have been entitled to the rights, protections and benefits provided under the FLSA.
- 12. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and those similarly situated to Plaintiff who worked for Defendant within Arkansas have been entitled to the rights, protections and benefits provided under the AMWA.
- 13. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and those similarly situated were not paid time and one half of their regular rate for all hours they worked over forty (40) per week in violation of the FLSA and the AMWA.
- 14. Defendant is an "employer" within the meanings set forth in the FLSA and AMWA, and was, at all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, Plaintiff's employer.
- 15. Defendant The Lilly Company is a foreign corporation registered to do business in the State of Arkansas.

16. The registered agent of Defendant for service of process in Arkansas is The Corporation Company, 124 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 1900,

Little Rock, Arkansas.

17. The Lilly Company is sells materials handling products and services and has locations in Arkansas, Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi.

18. Defendant has employees that handle, sell, or otherwise work with goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce.

19. Defendant's annual gross volume of sales is not less than \$500,000.00.

20. Defendant has more than four employees.

IV.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

21. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.

- 22. Defendant owns and operates at least one location in Arkansas.
- 23. Plaintiff was employed at Defendant's location in Jonesboro from approximately June of 2018 through September of 2018.
- 24. Plaintiff was employed as a Parts Department Manager at Defendant's Jonesboro location.
- 25. Plaintiff was required to work an average of more than fifty hours per week.
- 26. Defendant classified Plaintiff as a salaried employee and paid him the same weekly salary regardless of the number of hours he worked.

Page 4 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-____
Original Complaint—Collective Action

27. As a Parts Department Manager, Plaintiff had substantially the

same duties as the hourly-paid employees with whom he worked.

28. Plaintiff did not have the authority to discipline or fire other

employees.

29. Plaintiff's primary duty did not include the management of other

employees.

30. Plaintiff's primary duty did not include the exercise of independent

judgment with respect to matters of significance.

31. As a Parts Department Manager, Plaintiff's primary duties were

filling orders for mechanical parts for Defendant's customers and mechanics.

32. Defendant paid Plaintiff the same weekly salary regardless of how

many hours he worked.

33. Upon information and belief, Department Managers at Defendant's

other locations perform similar duties and are similarly misclassified as exempt

salaried employees.

٧.

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

A. FLSA § 216(b) Collective

34. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this

Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

35. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and all others similarly situated have

been entitled to the rights, protections and benefits provided by the FLSA and the

AMWA.

Page 5 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-____
Original Complaint—Collective Action

36. 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).

37. Plaintiff brings his FLSA claims on behalf of all of Defendant's employees who were classified as exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and paid a salary by Defendant at any time within the applicable statute of limitations period, who are entitled to payment of the following types of damages:

A. A lawful minimum wage and overtime for all hours worked;

B. Liquidated damages; and

C. attorneys' fees and costs.

38. In conformity with the requirements of FLSA Section 16(b), Plaintiff has attached hereto as Exhibit "A" his written Consent to Join this lawsuit.

39. The relevant time period dates back three years from the date on which Plaintiff's Original Complaint—Collective Action was filed herein and continues forward through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

40. The members of the proposed FLSA Collective are similarly situated in that they were subject to Defendant's common policy of paying a salary with no overtime premiums to Department Managers.

41. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of the potential members of the FLSA Collective but believes that the group exceeds 20 persons.

42. In the modern era, most working-class Americans have become increasingly reliant on email and text messages, and generally use them just as often, if not more so, than traditional U.S. Mail.

43. Defendant can readily identify the members of the Section 16(b)

Collective. The names and physical addresses, email addresses and phone

numbers of the FLSA collective action plaintiffs are available from Defendant,

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 numbers as soon as possible,

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

claim.

44. At all relevant times, Defendant directly hired members of the

Collective Action Class to work in warehouses, paid them wages, controlled their

work schedules, duties, protocols, applications, assignments and employment

conditions, and kept at least some records regarding their employment.

45. At all relevant times, each member of the Collective regularly

engaged in interstate commerce or handled, sold, or otherwise worked with

goods or materials that had been moved in or produced for interstate commerce.

VI.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

46. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this

Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.

47. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief

pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

Page 7 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

48. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiff's "employer" within the

meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

49. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

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

203.

50. 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 one and one-half times 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.

51. For the duration of his employment, Defendant intentionally

misclassified Plaintiff as exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA,

when in fact Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee entitled to overtime pay.

52. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to minimum wage and overtime

payments under the FLSA, Defendant 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.

53. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed was

willful.

54. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiff for monetary damages, liquidated damages, and costs, including

Page 8 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

reasonable attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

VII.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

- 55. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.
- 56. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 *et seq*.
- 57. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiff's "employer" within the meaning of the AMWA, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-203(4).
- 58. 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.
- 59. For the duration of his employment, Defendant misclassified Plaintiff as exempt from the overtime requirements of the AMWA, when in fact Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee entitled to overtime pay.
- 60. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to minimum wage and overtime payments under the AMWA, Defendant 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.

Page 9 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-____
Original Complaint—Collective Action

61. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is 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 CAUSE OF ACTION

(Collective Action Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

- 62. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.
- 63. 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.
- 64. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an "employer" of Plaintiff and all those similarly situated within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.
- 65. Defendant classified Plaintiff and all similarly situated Department Managers as exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA, when in fact they were non-exempt employees entitled to overtime pay.
- 66. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and those similarly situated to minimum wage and overtime payments under the FLSA, Defendant 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.

67. This court should certify the following collective:

All salaried employees employed as Department Managers for Defendant during the three years preceding the filing of this lawsuit.

- 68. Defendant willfully failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and to others similarly situated.
- 69. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and all those similarly situated 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.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Robert Sarrels, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and the members of the proposed Section 216 collective, respectfully prays as follows:

- A. That Defendant The Lilly Company be summoned to appear and answer this Complaint;
- B. For orders regarding certification of and notice to the proposed collective members;
- C. For an order entering judgment in his favor against Defendant for his actual economic damages in an amount to be determined at trial;

Page 11 of 12
Robert Sarrels, et al. v. The Lilly Company
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 3:18-cv-____
Original Complaint—Collective Action

- D. For liquidated damages as provided for under the FLSA and the AMWA;
 - E. For his attorneys' fees, costs, and pre-judgment interest; and
- F. For such other and further relief as this Court deems necessary, just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT SARRELS, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFF

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC ONE FINANCIAL CENTER 650 SOUTH SHACKLEFORD, SUITE 411 LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72211 TELEPHONE: (501) 221-0088 FACSIMILE: (888) 787-2040

By:

Steve Rauls

Ark. Bar No. 2011170 steve@sanfordlawfirm.com

and

Josh Sanford
Ark. Bar No. 2001037
josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

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

ROBERT SARRELS, Individually and on Behalf of Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFF

VS.

No. 3:18-cv-____

THE LILLY COMPANY

DEFENDANT

CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION

I was been employed as a salaried department manager for Defendant The Lilly Company on or after October 5, 2015. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for unpaid wages and other relief. I consent to becoming a party-plaintiff in 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.

ROBERT SARRELS

2 Samely

Date: October 3, 2018

/s/ Josh Sanford
Josh Sanford, Esq.
SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC
One Financial Center
650 South Shackleford Road, Suite 411
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088
Facsimile: (888) 787-2040
iosh@sanfordlawfirm.com

The JS 44 (rev. 11/15)

CIVIL COVER SHEET 3: 18-cy-187-BSM

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.

(SEF INSTRICTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil do	cket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE C	OF THIS FO	DRM.)				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS				
ROBERT SARRELS, Individually and on Behalf of all Others Simila Situated				THE LILLY COMPANY				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Craighead (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Josh Sanford and Steve Rauls, SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC, One				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)				
				Financial Center, 650 So			ie	
Arkansas 72211; 501-22								
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
□ 1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only) P1	rf def		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citiz	Citizen of This State				
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citiz	Citizen of Another State				
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT								
CONTRACT		RTS		ORFEITURE/PENALTY	T	IKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury -		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appe	eal 28 USC 158 drawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	□ 69	90 Other	28 U	ISC 157	3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical				RTY RIGHTS	☐ 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	of Judgment Slander Person 330 Federal Employers' Produ				☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent		☐ 430 Banks and Banking☐ 450 Commerce	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Persona	ո		☐ 840 Trade		☐ 460 Deportation	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability		LABOR	SOCIAL	SECURITY	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPE	RTY 🗗 7	10 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA	(1395ff)	☐ 480 Consumer Credit☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending	0.72	Act 20 Labor/Management		C/DIWW (405(g))	□ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
☐ 190 Other Contract☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage	. _ 7	Relations 40 Railway Labor Act	☐ 864 SSID ☐ 865 RSI (Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	☐ 385 Property Damage		51 Family and Medical		(8))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	O 7	Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation			☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS 0 7	91 Employee Retirement		s (U.S. Plaintiff	Act ☐ 896 Arbitration	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee	l	Income Security Act		efendant)	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	☐ 510 Motions to Vacat Sentence	te			-Third Party JSC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	☐ 530 General			1 200	50 700	☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	Other:	O 4	IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application	-		State Statutes	
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	☐ 540 Mandamus & Oti ☐ 550 Civil Rights	her 🗇 4	65 Other Immigration Actions				
	☐ 448 Education	555 Prison Condition		Actions				
		☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of						
		Confinement			1			
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is ★1 Original □ 2 Re		Remanded from	□ 4 Rei	nstated or	erred from	☐ 6 Multidistr	rict	
Proceeding Sta	ate Court	Appellate Court	Reo	pened Anothe	er District	Litigation		
	29 USC 201 et s	atute under which you a eq.	are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional state	tutes unless di	versity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca FLSA Violation: U	ause: Unpaid Overtime						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	N I	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No						
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER		
DATE /		SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE/ONLY	18	$\overline{}$	8	/				
•	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	ンレ	JUDGE		MAG, JU	DGE	

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: 'Misclassified' Ex-Employee Sues The Lilly Company for Allegedly Unpaid OT