

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA  
PITTSBURGH DIVISION

BURTON WILLIFORD, individually  
and on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICE ENERGY, INC.,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CLASS/COLLECTIVE ACTION  
PURSUANT TO 29 U.S.C. § 216(b)/  
FED. R. CIV. P. 23

**ORIGINAL CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

**I. SUMMARY**

1. Plaintiff Burton Williford (“Williford”) brings this lawsuit to recover unpaid overtime wages and other damages from Rice Energy, Inc. (“Rice Energy” or “Defendant”) under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), the Ohio Minimum Fair Wage Standards Act, O.R.C. §§4111 *et seq.*, (“the Ohio Wage Act”), and the Ohio Prompt Pay Act (“OPPA”), Ohio Rev. Code §4113.15 (the Ohio Wage Act and the OPPA will be referred to collectively as “the Ohio Acts”).

2. Rice Energy is an oil and natural gas company operating primarily in Pennsylvania and Ohio in the Marcellus, Utica, and Upper Devonian Shales.<sup>1</sup> To do so, Rice Energy employs oilfield personnel to carry out its work.

3. Williford worked for Defendant as a Drilling Fluid Engineer.<sup>2</sup>

4. Plaintiff and the other workers like him regularly worked for Defendant in excess of forty (40) hours each week.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.riceenergy.com/operations#/where-we-operate>.

<sup>2</sup> Drilling Fluid Engineers are also sometimes referred to as Mud Engineers. As used in this Complaint, the term “Drilling Fluid Engineer” is intended to refer to both titles.

5. But these workers never received overtime for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a single workweek.

6. Instead of paying overtime as required by the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts, Defendant improperly classified Plaintiff and those similarly situated workers as independent contractors and paid them a daily rate with no overtime compensation.

7. This class and collective action seeks to recover the unpaid overtime wages and other damages owed to these workers.

## II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action involves a federal question under the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

9. The Court has federal jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the jurisdictional provisions of the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). The Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over any state law sub-class pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

10. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because Rice Energy's corporate headquarters are located in this District.

## III. THE PARTIES

11. Williford worked for Rice Energy as a Drilling Fluid Engineer from approximately June 2014 until April 2017.

12. Throughout his employment with Rice Energy, Plaintiff was paid a day-rate with no overtime compensation and was classified as an independent contractor.

13. Williford's consent to be a party plaintiff is attached as Exhibit A.

14. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated workers who were classified as independent contractors and paid by Defendant's day-rate system. Defendant paid each of these workers a flat amount for each day worked and failed to pay them overtime for all

hours that they worked in excess of 40 hours in a workweek in accordance with the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts.

15. The class of similarly situated employees or putative class members sought to be certified is defined as follows:

**CURRENT AND FORMER OILFIELD WORKERS  
EMPLOYED BY, OR WORKING ON BEHALF OF RICE  
ENERGY, INC. WHO WERE CLASSIFIED AS  
INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS AND PAID A DAY RATE  
("Putative Class Members")**

16. Williford also seeks class certification of such a class under FED. R. CIV. P. 23 under the Ohio Wage Acts.

17. Defendant **Rice Energy, Inc.**, is a Delaware corporation doing business throughout the United States, including in Pennsylvania and Ohio. Rice Energy may be served by serving its registered agent for service of process, **The Corporation Trust Company, at 1209 Orange St., Wilmington, DE 19801.**

#### **IV. COVERAGE UNDER THE FLSA**

18. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant has been an employer within the meaning of the Section 3(d) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

19. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant has been part of an enterprise within the meaning of Section 3(r) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).

20. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant has been part of an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of Section 3(s)(1) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1), in that said enterprise has and has had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person

and in that said enterprise has had and has an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated).

21. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Plaintiff and the Putative Class Members were engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

22. As will be shown through this litigation, Rice Energy treated Plaintiff the Putative Class Members as employees and uniformly dictated the pay practices Plaintiff and its other employees (including its so-called “independent contractors”) were subjected to.

23. Rice Energy’s misclassification of Williford as an independent contractor does not alter his status as an employee for purposes of the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts.

## V. FACTS

24. Defendant is an oil and natural gas company operating primarily in Pennsylvania and Ohio in the Marcellus, Utica, and Upper Devonian Shales. To complete their business objectives, Defendant hires personnel to perform work as drilling fluid engineers or mud engineers.

25. Many of these individuals worked for Defendant on a day-rate basis, were misclassified as independent contractors, and make up the proposed Putative Class. While exact job titles and job duties may differ, these employees are subjected to the same or similar illegal pay practices for similar work.

26. Rice Energy classified the Putative Class Members as independent contractors and paid them a flat sum for each day worked, regardless of the number of hours that they worked that day (or in that workweek) and failed to provide them with overtime pay for hours that they worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek.

27. For example, Williford worked for Defendant as a Drilling Fluid Engineer from approximately August 2016 until February 2017. Throughout his employment with Defendant, he was classified as an independent contractor and paid on a day-rate basis.

28. As an independent contractor, Plaintiff's primary job duties included monitoring fluid activities at jobsites, operating oilfield equipment, coordinating transfer of fluids between rigs, controlling fluid within defined specifications, and building and maintaining various fluid systems associated with the drilling and completion of wells, as needed. Plaintiff worked in excess of 40 hours each week while employed by Defendant, often for weeks at time.

29. The work Plaintiff performed was an essential and integral part of Defendant's core business.

30. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant while he was classified as an independent contractor, Rice Energy and/or the company it contracted with exercised control over all aspects of his job.

31. Rice Energy did not require any substantial investment by Plaintiff in order for him to perform the work required of him.

32. Rice Energy determined Plaintiff's opportunity for profit and loss. Plaintiff was not required to possess any unique or specialized skillset (other than that maintained by all other individuals working in his same job position) to perform their job duties.

33. Rice Energy and/or the company it contracted with controlled all the significant or meaningful aspects of the job duties performed by Plaintiff.

34. Defendant and/or the company it contracted with determined the hours and locations Plaintiff worked, tools used, and rates of pay received.

35. Even though Plaintiff often worked away from Rice Energy's offices without the presence of a direct Rice Energy supervisor, Rice Energy still controlled all aspects of Plaintiff's job activities by enforcing mandatory compliance with Rice Energy's and/or its client's policies and procedures.

36. No real investment was required of Plaintiff to perform his job.

37. More often than not, Plaintiff utilized equipment provided by Defendant and/or its clients to perform his job duties. Plaintiff did not provide the equipment they worked with on a daily basis.

38. Rice Energy and/or its clients made the large capital investments in buildings, machines, equipment, tools, and supplied in the business in which Plaintiff worked.

39. Plaintiff did not incur operating expenses like rent, payroll, marketing, and insurance.

40. Plaintiff was economically dependent on Rice Energy during his employment.

41. Defendant directly determined Plaintiff's rates of pay, his work schedule, and prohibited him from working other jobs for other companies while he was working on jobs for Rice Energy.

42. Rice Energy directly determined Plaintiff's opportunity for profit and loss. Plaintiff's earning opportunities were based on the number of days Rice Energy scheduled him to work.

43. Very little skill, training, or initiative was required of Plaintiff to perform his job duties.

44. Indeed, the daily and weekly activities of the Putative Class Members were routine and largely governed by standardized plans, procedures, and checklists created by Defendant and/or its clients. Virtually every job function was pre-determined by Defendant and/or its clients, including the tools to use at a job site, the data to compile, the schedule of work, and related work duties. The Putative Class Members were prohibited from varying their job duties outside of the pre-determined parameters.

45. Moreover, the job functions of the Putative Class Members were primarily manual labor/technical in nature, requiring little to no official training, much less a college education or other advanced degree.

46. The Putative Class Members did not have any supervisory or management duties.

47. Plaintiff was not employed by Defendant on a project-by-project basis. In fact, while Plaintiff was classified as an independent contractor, he was regularly on call for Defendant and/or its clients and was expected to drop everything and work whenever needed.

48. All of the Putative Class Members perform the same or similar job duties and are subjected to the same or similar policies and procedures which dictate the day-to-day activities performed by each person.

49. The Putative Class Members also worked similar hours and were denied overtime as a result of the same illegal pay practice.

50. Defendant's policy of failing to pay their independent contractors, including Plaintiff, overtime violates the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts because these workers are, for all purposes, employees performing non-exempt job duties.

51. It is undisputed that the contractors are operating oilfield machinery, performing manual labor, and working long hours out in the field.

52. Because Plaintiff (and Defendant's other independent contractors) was misclassified as an independent contractor by Defendant, he should receive overtime for all hours that he worked in excess of 40 hours in each workweek.

53. Defendant's day-rate system violates the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts because Plaintiff and those similarly situated did not receive any overtime pay for hours worked over 40 hours each week.

## **VI. FLSA VIOLATIONS**

54. As set forth herein, Defendant has violated, and is violating, Section 7 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207, by employing employees in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA for workweeks longer than forty (40) hours

without compensating such employees for their employment in excess of forty (40) hours per week at rates no less than 1 and ½ times the regular rates for which they were employed.

55. Defendant knowingly, willfully, or in reckless disregard carried out this illegal pattern or practice of failing to pay the Putative Class Members overtime compensation. Defendant failure to pay overtime compensation to these employees was neither reasonable, nor was the decision not to pay overtime made in good faith.

56. Accordingly, Plaintiff and all those who are similarly situated are entitled to overtime wages under the FLSA in an amount equal to 1 and ½ times their rate of pay, plus liquidated damages, attorney's fees and costs.

## **VII. OHIO WAGE ACT VIOLATIONS**

57. Williford brings this claim under the Ohio Wage Act as a Rule 23 class action.

58. The conduct alleged violates the Ohio Wage Act (O.R.C. §§4111).

59. At all relevant times, Defendant was subjected to the requirements of the Ohio Wage Act.

60. At all relevant times, Defendant employed Williford and each Class Member with Ohio state law claims as an “employee” within the meaning of the Ohio Wage Act.

61. The Ohio Wage Act requires employers like Defendant to pay employees at one and one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in any one week. Williford and each member of the Ohio Wage Act Class are entitled to overtime pay under the Ohio Wage Acts.

62. Defendant had a policy and practice of misclassifying Williford and each member of the Ohio Wage Act class as independent contractors and failing to pay these workers overtime for hours worked in excess of 40 hours per workweek.



63. Williford and each member of the Ohio Wage Act Class seek unpaid overtime in amount equal to 1.5 times the regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of 40 hours in a workweek, prejudgment interest, all available penalty wages, and such other legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

64. Williford and each member of the Ohio Wage Act Class also seek recovery of attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses of this action, to be paid by Defendant, as provided by the Ohio Wage Act.

### **VIII. CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

65. Plaintiff incorporates all previous paragraphs and alleges that the illegal pay practices Defendant imposed on Plaintiff were likewise imposed on the Putative Class Members.

66. Numerous individuals were victimized by this pattern, practice, and policy which is in willful violation of the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts.

67. Numerous other individuals who worked with Plaintiff indicated they were improperly classified as independent contractors, paid in the same manner, performed similar work, and were not properly compensated for all hours worked as required by state and federal wage laws.

68. Based on his experiences and tenure with Defendant, Plaintiff is aware that Defendant's illegal practices were imposed on the Putative Class Members.

69. The Putative Class Members were all improperly classified as independent contractors and not afforded the overtime compensation when they worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

70. Defendant's failure to pay wages and overtime compensation at the rates required by state and/or federal law result from generally applicable, systematic policies, and practices which are not dependent on the personal circumstances of the Putative Class Members.

71. Plaintiff's experiences are therefore typical of the experiences of the Putative Class Members.

72. The specific job titles or precise job locations of the Putative Class Members do not prevent class or collective treatment.

73. Plaintiff has no interests contrary to, or in conflict with, the Putative Class Members. Like each Putative Class Member, Plaintiff has an interest in obtaining the unpaid overtime wages owed to him under state and/or federal law.

74. A class and collective action, such as the instant one, is superior to other available means for fair and efficient adjudication of the lawsuit.

75. Absent this action, many Putative Class Members likely will not obtain redress of their injuries and Defendant will reap the unjust benefits of violating the FLSA and applicable state labor laws.

76. Furthermore, even if some of the Putative Class Members could afford individual litigation against Defendant, it would be unduly burdensome to the judicial system.

77. Concentrating the litigation in one forum will promote judicial economy and parity among the claims of individual members of the classes and provide for judicial consistency.

78. The questions of law and fact common to the Putative Class Members predominate over any questions affecting solely the individual members. Among the common questions of law and fact are:

- a. Whether Defendant employed the Putative Class Members within the meaning of the applicable state and federal statutes, including the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts;
- b. Whether the Putative Class Members were improperly misclassified as independent contractors;
- c. Whether Defendant's decision to classify the Putative Class Members as independent contractors was made in good faith;

- d. Whether Defendant's decision to not pay time and a half for overtime to the Putative Class Members was made in good faith;
- e. Whether Defendant's violation of the FLSA and Ohio Wage Acts was willful; and
- f. Whether Defendant's illegal pay practices were applied uniformly across the nation to all Putative Class Members.

79. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Putative Class Members. Plaintiff and the Putative Class Members sustained damages arising out of Defendant's illegal and uniform employment policy.

80. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty that will be encountered in the management of this litigation that would preclude its ability to go forward as a collective or class action.

81. Although the issue of damages may be somewhat individual in character, there is no detraction from the common nucleus of liability facts. Therefore, this issue does not preclude collective and class action treatment.

#### **IX. JURY DEMAND**

82. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

#### **X. RELIEF SOUGHT**

83. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. An Order designating this lawsuit as a collective action and permitting the issuance of a notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated individuals with instructions to permit them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual Consents to Sue pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

- b. For an Order pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA finding Defendant liable for unpaid back wages due to Plaintiff and the Putative Class Members for liquidated damages equal in amount to their unpaid compensation;
- c. For an Order designating the state law classes as class actions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23;
- d. For an Order appointing Plaintiff and his counsel as Class Counsel to represent the interests of both the federal and state law classes;
- e. For an Order awarding attorneys' fees, costs and pre- and post-judgment interest; and
- f. For an Order granting such other and further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Joshua P. Geist

Joshua P. Geist  
PA. I.D. No. 85745  
**GOODRICH & GEIST, P.C.**  
3634 California Ave.  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212  
Tel: (412) 766-1455  
Fax: (412) 766-0300  
josh@goodrichandgeist.com

**AND**

Michael A. Josephson  
Texas Bar No. 24014780  
*(Pending Pro Hac Vice)*  
Andrew W. Dunlap  
Texas Bar No. 24078444  
*(Pending Pro Hac Vice)*  
**JOSEPHSON DUNLAP LAW FIRM**  
11 Greenway Plaza, Suite 3050  
Houston, Texas 77046  
713-352-1100 – Telephone  
713-352-3300 – Facsimile  
mjosephson@mybackwages.com  
adunlap@mybackwages.com

**AND**

Richard J. (Rex) Burch  
Texas Bar No. 24001807  
**BRUCKNER BURCH, P.L.L.C.**  
8 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1500  
Houston, Texas 77046  
713-877-8788 – Telephone  
713-877-8065 – Facsimile  
rburch@brucknerburch.com

**ATTORNEYS IN CHARGE FOR PLAINTIFF**

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.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

BURTON WILLIFORD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Rapides Parish (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Joshua P. Geist, Goodrich & Geist, PC, 3634 California Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15212

DEFENDANTS

RICE ENERGY, 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.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Table with 5 columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various legal categories like Insurance, Motor Vehicle, Personal Injury, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District, 6 Multidistrict Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 29 U.S.C. § 216(b)
Brief description of cause: Violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 07/18/2017 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Joshua P. Geist

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

JS 44AREVISED June, 2009  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA  
THIS CASE DESIGNATION SHEET MUST BE COMPLETED

**PART A**

This case belongs on the (  Erie  Johnstown  Pittsburgh) calendar.

1. **ERIE CALENDAR** - If cause of action arose in the counties of Crawford, Elk, Erie, Forest, McKean, Venang or Warren, OR any plaintiff or defendant resides in one of said counties.
2. **JOHNSTOWN CALENDAR** - If cause of action arose in the counties of Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Clearfield or Somerset OR any plaintiff or defendant resides in one of said counties.
3. Complete if on **ERIE CALENDAR**: I certify that the cause of action arose in \_\_\_\_\_ County and that the \_\_\_\_\_ resides in \_\_\_\_\_ County.
4. Complete if on **JOHNSTOWN CALENDAR**: I certify that the cause of action arose in \_\_\_\_\_ County and that the \_\_\_\_\_ resides in \_\_\_\_\_ County.

**PART B** (You are to check ONE of the following)

1.  This case is related to Number \_\_\_\_\_ . Short Caption \_\_\_\_\_
2.  This case is not related to a pending or terminated case.

**DEFINITIONS OF RELATED CASES:**

**CIVIL:** Civil cases are deemed related when a case filed relates to property included in another suit or involves the same issues of fact or it grows out of the same transactions as another suit or involves the validity or infringement of a patent involved in another suit

**EMINENT DOMAIN:** Cases in contiguous closely located groups and in common ownership groups which will lend themselves to consolidation for trial shall be deemed related.

**HABEAS CORPUS & CIVIL RIGHTS:** All habeas corpus petitions filed by the same individual shall be deemed related. All pro se Civil Rights actions by the same individual shall be deemed related.

**PART C**

**I. CIVIL CATEGORY** (Select the applicable category).

1.  Antitrust and Securities Act Cases
2.  Labor-Management Relations
3.  Habeas corpus
4.  Civil Rights
5.  Patent, Copyright, and Trademark
6.  Eminent Domain
7.  All other federal question cases
8.  All personal and property damage tort cases, including maritime, FELA, Jones Act, Motor vehicle, products liability, assault, defamation, malicious prosecution, and false arrest
9.  Insurance indemnity, contract and other diversity cases.
10.  Government Collection Cases (shall include HEW Student Loans (Education), V A Overpayment, Overpayment of Social Security, Enlistment Overpayment (Army, Navy, etc.), HUD Loans, GAO Loans (Misc. Types), Mortgage Foreclosures, SBA Loans, Civil Penalties and Coal Mine Penalty and Reclamation Fees.)

I certify that to the best of my knowledge the entries on this Case Designation Sheet are true and correct

Date: 07/13/2017

Joshua P. Geist

ATTORNEY AT LAW

NOTE: ALL SECTIONS OF BOTH ÔŠPRU MUST BE COMPLETED BEFORE CASE CAN BE PROCESSED.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

### Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.  
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.  
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.  
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.  
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.  
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.  
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.  
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.  
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.  
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.  
 Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.  
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.  
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.



# EXHIBIT A

**CONSENT TO JOIN WAGE CLAIM**

Print Name: Burton Krandal Williford

1. I hereby consent to participate in a collective action lawsuit against Rice Energy to pursue my claims of unpaid overtime during the time that I worked with the company.
2. I understand that this lawsuit is brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and consent to be bound by the Court's decision.
3. I designate the law firm and attorneys at JOSEPHSON DUNLAP as my attorneys to prosecute my wage claims.
4. I authorize the law firm and attorneys at JOSEPHSON DUNLAP to use this consent to file my claim in a separate lawsuit, class/collective action, or arbitration against the company.

Signature:   
Burton Krandal Williford (Jul 8, 2017)

Date Signed: Jul 8, 2017

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Pennsylvania

BURTON WILLIFORD, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated

Plaintiff(s)

v.

RICE ENERGY, INC.

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Rice Energy, Inc.
By and through its registered agent:
The Corporation Trust Company
1209 Orange St.
Wilmington, DE 19801

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you
are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ.
P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of
the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
whose name and address are: Joshua P. Geist
Goodrich & Geist, PC
3634 California Ave.
Pittsburg, PA 15212

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

*(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))*

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_ , who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 0.00 \_\_\_\_\_ .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

**Print**

**Save As...**

**Reset**

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Drilling Fluid Engineer Claims Rice Energy Misclassifies Workers, Refuses to Pay OT Wages](#)

---