UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Kim Baker, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Civil Action No.
Plaintiff.	
\mathbf{v} .	
American Care Partners at Home, Inc.,	
Defendant.	

PLAINTIFF'S COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Kim Baker ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action against American Care Partners at Home, Inc. ("Defendant"), for damages and other relief relating to violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. ("FLSA"). Plaintiff states the following for her claims against Defendant:

OVERVIEW

- 1. Plaintiff brings claims to recover unpaid overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act. She brings these claims on her own behalf, and as a collective action on behalf of all current or former similarly situated home healthcare workers who may choose to opt in to this action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 2. As described below, Defendant misclassified Plaintiff and other similarly situated home healthcare workers as independent contractors and failed to pay Plaintiff and those similarly situated 1.5 times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in a workweek. By doing so, Defendant has violated the FLSA.

THE PARTIES

Plaintiff

- 3. Plaintiff Kim Baker is an adult resident of the state of Virginia. Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a home healthcare worker, specifically a Certified Nursing Assistant ("CNA"), from approximately May 2014 to May 2016.
- 4. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Plaintiff Baker consents in writing to be a party to the FLSA claims asserted. Her consent form is attached as **Exhibit A**. As this case proceeds, it is likely other individuals will file consent forms and join as opt-in plaintiffs.
- 5. Plaintiff and those similarly situated are or were employees of Defendant within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(1).

Defendant

- 6. Defendant American Care Partners at Home, Inc. is a Virginia corporation with its principal place of business in Falls Church, Virginia. Defendant is a home healthcare agency that provides in-home healthcare services for children and adults.
- 7. Defendant is or has been an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods or services for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1), and, upon information and belief, has had an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000 at all relevant times.
- 8. Upon information and belief. Defendant had a practice of unlawfully and improperly classifying its home healthcare workers, including Plaintiff and those similarly situated, as "independent contractors."
- 9. At all relevevant times, Defendant is, and has been, an "employer" of Plaintiff and those similarly situated within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

10. Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, are or were individual employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods or services for commerce. 29 U.S.C. § 207.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 11. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, because Plaintiff's claims arise under the Fair Labor Standards Act. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant regularly conducts business in the Eastern District of Virginia.
- 12. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) because Defendant resides within this District, and under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 13. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 14. Plaintiff and those similarly situated worked for Defendant as home healthcare workers to provide companionship and related in-home care services for Defendant's clients.
- 15. From approximately May 2014, when Defendant hired Plaintiff, until the end of January 2015, Defendant classified Plaintiff as its employee.
- 16. Beginning January 30, 2015, however, Defendant unlawfully classified Plaintiff as an "independent contractor" in order to avoid its obligations to pay overtime under federal law. Defendant informed Plaintiff that she would be required to change her classification from "employee" to "independent contractor" if she wanted to continue to work over forty (40) hours per week going forward. In addition to unlawfully withholding overtime pay. Defendant also initiated its "independent contractor" misclassification scheme in order to improperly reap other

benefits, including reducing its tax liability, avoiding workers' compensation, and passing operating costs on to its workforce. Upon information and belief, Defendant implemented this unlawful "independent contractor" misclassification scheme across its workforce, including Plaintiff and those similarly situated.

- 17. Despite calling Plaintiff and those similarly situated "independent contractors," Defendant's home healthcare workers were and are, in fact, employees under federal law.
- 18. Plaintiff and those similarly situated worked for Defendant on a full-time and continuing basis, and did not advertise their services to the general public.
- 19. Plaintiff and those similarly situated were also subject to Defendant's direction and control regarding the manner in which they performed their work. For instance:
 - a. Defendant required its home healthcare workers to follow Defendant's instructions, processes, and policies regarding the methods by which their work was to be completed.
 - b. Defendant's home healthcare workers did not generate their own business. The clients for whom they provided care were individuals who had enrolled with Defendant to receive home care services.
 - c. Defendant required its home healthcare workers to follow a "care plan," which outlined daily tasks to be completed during each shift. They were required to note the specific tasks completed each shift on the timesheets that were submitted to Defendant.
 - d. Defendant required its home healthcare workers to record their hours worked each day on timesheets, which Defendant provided. Timesheets were required to be submitted to Defendant for approval and payment each pay period.

- e. Defendant determined the workers' hourly rates of pay.
- f. Defendant required its home healthcare workers to maintain Professional Liability Insurance as a condition of employment.
- g. Defendant required its home healthcare workers to communicate any changes in their work schedule/hours to Defendant, in advance of the changes.
- h. Defendant had the ability to discipline its home healthcare workers if they did not follow Defendant's policies and procedures.
- Defendant required its home healthcare workers to wear uniforms, which consisted of scrub pants and a scrub top.
- 20. Tellingly, after Defendant changed the classification of its home healthcare workers from "employee" to "independent contractor," Plaintiff did not experience any changes in the ways Defendant controlled her work. Through its policies, practices, and supervisors, Defendant continued to direct the work activity of Plaintiff and those similarly situated as if they were employees of Defendant.
- 21. Defendant has suffered and permitted Plaintiff to regularly work more than forty (40) hours in certain workweeks. During her employment with Defendant, Plaintiff's hours varied from week to week. However, Plaintiff often worked between approximately fifty (50) and sixty (60) (or more) hours per week. Upon information and belief, Defendant has also suffered and permitted other similarly situated home healthcare workers to regularly work more than forty (40) hours in certain workweeks.
- 22. Plaintiff and those similarly situated were not compensated in accordance with the FLSA because they were not paid proper overtime wages for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per workweek. Specifically, rather than paying them 1.5 times their regular rate of pay for

all hours worked over forty (40) in a workweek, which is required by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207, Defendant paid them only "straight time" for overtime hours.

23. Defendant was aware that Plaintiff and those similarly situated performed worked overtime hours. Defendant coordinated Plaintiff's work schedule and required Plaintiff and those similarly situated to report their work hours via weekly timesheets, which routinely reflected overtime hours. As set forth above, Defendant improperly paid only straight time, not time and-a-half, for overtime hours worked.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 24. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 25. Plaintiff brings Count I of this action individually and on behalf and all similarly situated individuals. Plaintiff seeks certification of the following FLSA collective:

All current or former home healthcare workers who have worked for Defendant from January 1, 2015 to the present.

- 26. Pursuant to the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 207, employers are generally required to pay overtime compensation at an hourly rate of 1.5 times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked over forty (40) in a workweek.
- 27. The FLSA contains an exemption from overtime for "domestic workers" who provide companionship and other services to individuals who were unable to care for themselves, and also contains an exemption for live in domestic service workers. *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 213(b)(21) and 213(a)(15). In October 2013, the United States Department of Labor determined that these exemptions do not apply to domestic-service workers employed by third-party agencies or employers.

- 28. Beginning on January 1, 2015, the regulations provide that domestic-service workers employed by third-party agencies or employers are not exempt from the FLSA's minimum wage and overtime requirements. 29 C.F.R. § 552.109(a). Accordingly, as of January 1, 2015, all domestic-service workers employed by third-party agencies or employers are entitled to overtime compensation at an hourly rate of 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked over forty (40) in a work week.
- 29. Since January 1, 2015, Plaintiff and those similarly situated have worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek for Defendant without receiving proper overtime compensation for their overtime hours worked.
- 30. As an example, for the two-week pay period ending on November 29, 2015, Defendant paid Plaintiff a regular rate of \$11.50 per hour for the 112 hours she worked.

 No overtime wages were paid.
- 31. As a result of its unlawful classification of Plaintiff and those similarly situated as independent contractors, and its failure to pay them the overtime compensation required by law.

 Defendant has violated the provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 207 and 215(a)(2).
- 32. Upon information and belief, Defendant is and was aware of its improper failure to pay overtime to Plaintiff and those similarly situated. This is evidence by the timing of Defendant's reclassification of Plaintiff and those similarly situated from "employee" to "independent contractor" in January 2015. The timing of this improper reclassification coincided with the change in the FLSA's regulations, which, as set forth above, provide that domestic-service workers employed by third-party agencies or employers are not exempt from the FLSA's minimum wage and overtime requirements.

33. Defendant knowingly, willfully, or in reckless disregard of the law, maintained an illegal practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective proper overtime compensation for all hours worked over forty (40).

CAUSES OF ACTION

<u>COUNT I – OVERTIME WAGES</u> FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT – 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seg.

On Behalf of Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective

- 34. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 35. The FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207, requires employers to pay non-exempt employees 1.5 times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) hours per workweek.
- 36. Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiff and those similarly situated to routinely work more than forty (40) hours in a workweek without proper overtime compensation as required by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* and its implementing regulations.
- 37. Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for the fact, that it failed to pay these individuals proper overtime compensation in violation of the FLSA.
- 38. Defendant's failure to comply with the FLSA overtime protections caused Plaintiff and those similarly situated to suffer loss of wages and interest thereon.
- 39. Plaintiff and those similarly situated are entitled to unpaid overtime, liquidated damages, and attorney's fees and costs under the FLSA.

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated, prays for relief as follows:

- A. Permitting this case to proceed as a collective action under § 216(b) of the FLSA and ordering notice to the putative plaintiffs at the earliest opportunity to ensure their claims are not lost to the FLSA statute of limitations;
- B. Judgment that Plaintiff and those similarly situated are employees and are entitled to the overtime protections under the FLSA;
- C. Judgment against Defendant for violation of the overtime provisions of the FLSA;
- D. Judgment that Defendant's violations of the FLSA were willful;
- E. An award to Plaintiff and those similarly situated in the amount of unpaid overtime wages and liquidated damages;
- F. An award of any pre- and post-judgment interest;
- G. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;
- H. Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by the Court; and
- I. Such further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.

Dated: December 5, 2017

Respectfully Submitted:

Gregg C. Greenberg, VA Bar No. 79610

ggreenberg@zagfirm.com

ZIPPIN, AMSTER & GREENBERG

8757 Georgia Ave., Suite 400

Silver Spring, MD 20910 Telephone: (301) 587-9373

Facsimile: (240) 839-9142

and

Robert L. Schug* schug@nka.com Jason D. Friedman* jfriedman@nka.com NICHOLS KASTER, PLLP 4600 IDS Center, 80 S. 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 Telephone: (612) 256-3200 Facsimile: (612) 215-6870

*To be admitted pro hac vice

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF AND THOSE SIMILARLY SITUATED

Case 1:17-cv-01387-LMB-MSN Document 1-1 Filed 12/06/17 Page 1 of 1 PageID# 11 $\frac{15.44 \cdot (Rev. (06.17))}{CIVIL\ COVER\ SHEET}$

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 1934, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SFF INSTRI CTIONS ON MEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Kim Baker, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated.				DEFENDANTS American Care Partners at Home, Inc.,				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff: Caroline (EXCEPTINUS, PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant For Cook VA (IN U.S. PERINTIFF CISES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LRACE OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Gregg C. Greenberg, Zipin Amster & Gree 8757 Georgia Avenue				Attorneys (It Know				
Telephone: (301) 587 II. BASIS OF JURISD		One Rea Oale	н ст	LIZEZSHID OF	DDINGI	DAI DADTIFE	Place on A on One Box to Plan	
7 1 U.S. Government			,	For Diversity Cases Only	1.7		OPtime an A. In One Box tor Plant and One Box for Detendants	
Plaintiff			Citize	itizen of This State PTF DEF PTF			mnorpal Place 7 4 7 4	
7 2 U.S. Government Defendant 7 4 Diversity Administrate Contraction on Parties on In-		inp of Parties in Item III)	Citizei	Citizen of Another State 7 2 7 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State			Principal Place 7.5 7.5 Another State	
				r or Subject of a agn Country	ר ; ר	3 Foreign Nation	٦ 6 ٦ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI		outi) DRTS	120	DELICE DE DESTACA			of Suit Code Descriptions	
7 110 Insurance 7 120 Marine 7 120 Miller Act 7 140 Negotiable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY 7 346 Airplane 7 345 Airplane Product Luability	PERSONAL INJURY 3 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	7 625	RFEITURE/PENALTY Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Other	7 422 A 1 7 423 W	ANKRUPTCY ppenl 28 USC 158 ithdrawal 8 USC 157	7 378 False Claims Act 7 376 Qui Tam (3) USC 3729(a))	
□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Futorcement of Judgmen □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	□ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers	7 367 Health Care Pharmaceurical Personal Injury Product Liability 7 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	1			PERTY RIGHTS opyrights item tem - Abbreviated w Drug Application a lowed	7 400 State Reapportionmen 7 410 Antirust 7 430 Banks and Banking 7 450 Commerce 7 460 Deportation 7 476 Racketeer Influenced and	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Unbility ☐ 196 Franchise	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	▼ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ■ 720 Labor Management Relations ■ 740 Radway Labor Act ■ 751 Family and Medical		■ \$40 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 1861 HTV (1395ff) 1862 Black Lung (923) 1863 DIWC DIWW (405(g)) 1864 SSID Title XVI 1865 RSI (405(g))		Corrupt Organizations 7 480 Consumer Credit 7 490 Cable Sat TV 7 856 Securities Commodities f vehange 7 890 Other Statutory Actions 7 891 Agricultural Vets 7 893 Environmental Matters	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	∃ ק -₀₀	Leave Act Other Labor Lingation	FEDE	RAL TAX SUITS	Net 1 895 Freedom of Information	
7 210 Land Condemnation 2 220 Forcelosure 7 230 Rent Lease & Fjectment 7 240 Torts to Land 7 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing Accommodations	Habeas Corpus: 7 463 Alien Detainee 7 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 7 530 General	7 791	7/91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act		ves (U.S. Plaintiff Defendant) S.— Third Party USC 7609	□ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act Review of Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of	
□ 290 All Other Real Property	1 445 Amer, w Disabilities - Employment 1 446 Amer, w Disabilities - Other 1 448 Education 1 448 Fducation 2 550 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		□ 462 □ 465	IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions		State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place in "X" in N 1 Original Proceeding 7 2 Ret State	moyed from .7 3	Remanded from 7 4 Appellate Court	4 Reinsta Reopei	114113	ier District	7 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca	tute under which you are fi s Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 use: o pay overtime wages	iling (Do				meetine	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION			MAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ¬ Yes ¬No				
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions)	JUDGE				EI NUMBER		
19.7	64.7	SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	XIY OF	RECORD	Z			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP	77	N4DC4F		MAG, JUDO	ık	

AMERICAN CARE PARTNERS AT HOME, INC. PLAINTIFF CONSENT FORM

- 1. I consent to make a claim under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. against my current/former employer(s), American Care Partners at Home, Inc. and any other related entities or affiliates, to recover overtime pay.
- 2. During the past three years, there were occasions when I worked over 40 hours per week for American Care Partners at Home, Inc. as a home care worker, or similar job title, and did not receive proper compensation for my overtime hours worked.
- 3. If this case does not proceed collectively, then I also consent to join any subsequent action to assert these claims against American Care Partners at Home, Inc. and any other related entities or affiliates.

Data: 11/12/2017

Signature

Kim Baker

Print Name

Information Below Will Be Redacted in Filings with the Court. Please Print or Type.

Redacted.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Lawsuit: American Care Partners at Home Robbed Employees of FLSA Protections</u>