UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

LIANET B. BATISTA and LUCY GALVEZ, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No.:

SANTO COYOTE, INC., and MARTIN JIMENEZ, an individual,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs, LIANET B. BATISTA and LUCY GALVEZ ("Plaintiffs"), by and through undersigned counsel, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all others similarly situated, bring this action against Defendants, SANTO COYOTE, INC. and MARTIN JIMENEZ, in his individual capacity, ("Defendants"), and in support of their claims states as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This is an action for damages under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"),
29 U.S.C. § 201 <u>et seq.</u>, for failure to pay a minimum wage, and overtime wages under 29 U.S.C. § 215(a)(3).

2. This Complaint is filed as a collective action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.

4. Venue is proper in the Middle District of Florida, because all of the events giving rise to these claims occurred in Hillsborough County, Florida, which lies within the Middle District.

PARTIES

 Named Plaintiff, LIANET B. BATISTA is a resident of Hillsborough County, Florida.

6. Named Plaintiff, LUCY GALVEZ is a resident of Hillsborough County, Florida.

7. Defendant, SANTO COYOTE, INC. operates a restaurant in Brandon, in Hillsborough County, Florida.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

8. Plaintiffs have satisfied all conditions precedent, or they have been waived.

9. Plaintiffs have hired the undersigned attorneys and agreed to pay them a fee.

10. Plaintiffs request a jury trial for all issues so triable.

11. At all times material hereto, Named Plaintiffs LIANET B. BATISTA and LUCY GALVEZ were employed by Defendants as servers.

12. The collective action of similarly situated employees consist of all other servers employed by Defendants within the last three years. These similarly situated persons will be referred to as "Members of the Collective Action" or "the Collective Action."

13. At all times material hereto, Named Plaintiffs and Members of the Collective Action were "engaged in the production of goods" for commerce within the meaning of Sections 6 and 7 of the FLSA, and as such were subject to the individual coverage of the FLSA.

14. At all times material hereto, Named Plaintiffs and Members of the Collective Action were "employees" of Defendants within the meaning of the FLSA.

15. At all times material hereto, Defendants were an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

16. Defendants continue to be an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.

17. At all times material hereto, Defendants were and continue to be an enterprise covered by the FLSA, as defined under 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(r) and 203(s).

18. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s).

19. At all times relevant to this action, the annual gross sales volume of Defendants exceeded \$500,000.00 per year.

20. Defendant, MARTIN JIMENEZ, is the owner of Defendant, SANTO COYOTE, INC.

21. Defendant, MARTIN JIMENEZ, supervised Named Plaintiffs and Members of the Collective Action, and exercised control over the wages, hours, and working conditions of Named Plaintiffs and the Members of the Collective Action. Defendant, MARTIN JIMENEZ, also controlled the payroll practices of SANTO COYOTE, INC.

22. Through the exercise of dominion and control over all employee-related matters at Defendant, SANTO COYOTE, INC., Defendant, MARTIN JIMENEZ, in his individual capacity, is also an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.

FACTS

23. Named Plaintiff, LIANET B. BATISTA began working for Defendants as a server in May 2015 until November 2017.

24. Named Plaintiff, LUCY GALVEZ began working for Defendants as a server in March 2015 and worked in this capacity until December 2017.

25. At all times material hereto, Named Plaintiffs and Members of the Collective Action worked hours at the direction of Defendants, and they were not paid at least the applicable minimum wage for all of the hours that they worked.

26. At various times material hereto, Named Plaintiffs and Members of the Collective Action worked hours in excess of forty hours within a work week for Defendants, and they were entitled to be paid an overtime premium equal to one and one-half times their regular hourly rate for all of these hours.

27. By failing to accurately record all of the hours worked by Named Plaintiffs and Members of the Collective Action, Defendants have failed to make, keep, and preserve records with respect to each of its employees in a manner sufficient to determine their wages, hours, and other conditions of employment, in violation of the FLSA. See 29 C.F.R. § 516.2.

28. Defendants' actions were willful, and showed reckless disregard for the provisions of the FLSA.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

29. Named Plaintiffs bring this case as an "opt-in" collective action on behalf of similarly situated employees of Defendants pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). The Collective Action is composed of servers whom Defendants failed to compensate for all overtime hours worked in accordance with the FLSA.

30. Therefore, notice is properly sent to: "All servers whom Defendants failed to pay at a rate that was at least equal to the applicable statutory minimum wage and all servers whom Defendants failed to compensate for all of the overtime hours that they worked from December 2014 to the present."

31. The total number and identities of the Collective Action members may be determined from the records of Defendants, and the Collective Action may easily and quickly be notified of the pendency of this action.

32. Named Plaintiffs are similar to the Collective Action because Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action have been unlawfully denied full payment of their overtime wages as mandated by the FLSA.

33. Named Plaintiffs' experience with Defendants' payroll practices is typical of the experiences of the Collective Action.

34. Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due at the premium rates required by the personal circumstances of the Named Plaintiffs or of similarly situated persons is common to the Collective Action.

35. Defendants' failure to pay all wages due at a rate that was at least equal to the applicable statutory minimum wage is common to the Collective Action.

36. Defendants' practice of making unlawful deductions from wages in violation of the FLSA is common to the Collective Action.

37. Overall, Named Plaintiffs' experience as servers who worked for Defendants is typical of the experience of the Collective Action.

38. Specific job titles or job duties of the Collective Action do not prevent collective treatment.

39. Although the issues of damages can be individual in character, there remains a common nucleus of operative facts concerning Defendants' liability under the FLSA in this case.

<u>COUNT I – FLSA OVERTIME VIOLATIONS</u>

40. Named Plaintiffs reallege and readopt the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 39 of this Complaint, as fully set forth herein. Named Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated employees in accordance with 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Named Plaintiffs anticipate that as this case proceeds, other individuals will sign consent forms and join this collective action as plaintiffs.

41. During the statutory period, Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action worked overtime hours while employed by Defendants, and they were not properly compensated for all of these hours under the FLSA.

42. Defendants failed to compensate Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action for all of the overtime hours that Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action worked.

43. The Members of the Collective Action are similarly situated because they were all employed as servers by Defendants, were compensated in the same manner, and were all subject to Defendants' common policy and practice of failing to pay its servers for all of the overtime hours that they worked in accordance with the FLSA.

44. This reckless practice violates the provisions of the FLSA; specifically, 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1). As a result, Named Plaintiffs and the Members of the Collective Action are individually entitled to an amount equal to their unpaid overtime wages as liquidated damages.

45. All of Defendants' conduct, as alleged and described above, constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

46. As a result of the foregoing, Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action have suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, Named Plaintiffs and all similarly situated employees who join this collective action demand:

- (a) Designation of this action as a collective action on behalf of the Named Plaintiffs and the prospective Collective Action that they seek to represent, in accordance with the FLSA;
- (b) Prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated members of the FLSA collective action, apprising them of the pendency of this action and permitting them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual consent to sue forms pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

- (c) Equitable tolling of the statute of limitations from the date of the filing of this complaint until the expiration of the deadline for filing consent to sue forms under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- (d) Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by this Court;
- Judgment against Defendants for an amount equal to the unpaid overtime wages of Named Plaintiffs and all opt-in Members of the Collective Action, at the applicable overtime rate;
- (f) A declaratory judgment stating that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the FLSA;
- Judgment against Defendants for an amount equal to the unpaid back wages of Named Plaintiffs and all opt-in Members of the Collective Action at the applicable overtime rate, as liquidated damages;
- Judgment against Defendants stating that their violations of the FLSA were willful;
- To the extent liquidated damages are not awarded, an award of prejudgment interest;
- (j) All costs and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting these claims; and
- (k) For such further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

<u>COUNT II – FLSA MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATION</u>

47. Named Plaintiffs reallege and readopt the allegations of paragraphs 1 through39 of this Complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

48. During the statutory period, Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action worked for Defendants, and they were not paid the applicable federal minimum wage for the hours that they worked, as mandated by the FLSA.

49. Defendants failed to compensate Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action at a rate that was at least equal to the applicable federal minimum wage.

50. The Members of the Collective Action are similarly situated because they were all employed as servers by Defendants, were compensated in the same manner, and were all subject to Defendants' common policy and practice of failing to pay its servers at a rate that was at least equal to the applicable federal minimum wage, in accordance with the FLSA.

51. This reckless practice violates the provisions of the FLSA, specifically 29 U.S.C. § 206(a)(1)(C). As a result, Named Plaintiffs and the Members of the Collective Action who have opted in to this action are each entitled to an amount equal to their unpaid minimum wages as liquidated damages.

52. All of Defendants' conduct, as alleged and described above, constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

53. As a result of the foregoing, Named Plaintiffs and the Collective Action have suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, Named Plaintiffs and all similarly situated employees who join this collective action demand:

- (a) Designation of this action as a collective action on behalf of the Named Plaintiffs and the prospective Collective Action that they seek to represent, in accordance with the FLSA;
- (b) Prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated members of the FLSA collective action, apprising them of the pendency of this action and permitting them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual consent to sue forms pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- (c) Equitable tolling of the statute of limitations from the date of the filing of this complaint until the expiration of the deadline for filing consent to sue forms under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- (d) Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by this Court;
- Judgment against Defendants for an amount equal to the unpaid minimum wages of Named Plaintiffs and all opt-in Members of the Collective Action;
- (f) A declaratory judgment stating that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the FLSA;

- Judgment against Defendants for an amount equal to the unpaid back wages of Named Plaintiffs and opt-in Members of the Collective Action at the applicable statutory minimum wage, as liquidated damages;
- (h) Judgment against Defendants stating that its violations of the FLSA were willful;
- To the extent liquidated damages are not awarded, an award of prejudgment interest;
- (j) All costs and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting these claims; and
- (k) For such further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff demands trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

Dated this day of February, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER J. SABA Florida Bar Number: 0092016 WENZEL FENTON CABASSA, P.A. 1110 North Florida Avenue, Suite 300 Tampa, Florida 33602 Main Number: 813-224-0431 Direct Dial: 813-321-4086 Facsimile: 813-229-8712 Email: csaba@wfclaw.com Email: tsoriano@wfclaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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. *ISEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM*.)

LIANET B. BATISTA and LUCY GALVEZ, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all others similarly situated, (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff	
CHRISTOPHER J. SABA, WENZEL FENTON CABASSA, P.A., 1110 North Florida Avenue, Suite 300, Tampa, Florida 33602, Main No.:	
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" or One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" or One Box for	
Image: Control of the U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question Of the Diversity Cases Only? and One Bax for Defendant Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) (U.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 of Business In This State 0 1 0 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4	DEF () 4
Image: Constraint of the Defendant Image: Constr	05
Citizen or Subject of a 🛛 3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation 🗇 6	06
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place on "X" in One Box Only)	
CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTE	<u>s</u>
□ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY □ 625 Drug Related Seizure □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 375 False Claims Act □ 120 Marine □ 310 Airplane □ 365 Personal Injury - □ 690 Other □ 423 Withdrawal □ 400 State Reapportion □ 130 Miller Act □ 315 Airplane Product Product Liability □ 690 Other □ 410 Natirust □ 410 Banks and Banking □ 140 Recovery of Overpayment □ 32 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical Pharmaceutical □ 450 Copyrights □ 460 Deportation	
□ 151 Medicare Act □ 330 Federal Employers' Product Liability □ 830 Patent □ 470 Racketeer Influenc □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted □ 340 Marine □ 368 Asbestos Personal □ 840 Trademark □ Corrupt Organizati Student Loans □ 340 Marine Injy Product □ 480 Consumer Credit (Excludes Veterans) □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
(Excludes Veterans) 345 Marine Product Liability LABOR SOCIAL SECURITY 490 Cable/Sat TV 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benetits 1350 Motor Vehicle 370 Other Fraud Act 861 HIA (1395ft) 850 Securites/Common Exchange 160 Stockholders' Suits 3355 Motor Vehicle 371 Trath in Lending 220 Labor:Management 863 Black Lung (923) Exchange 190 Other Contract Product Liability 380 Other Personal Property Damage 740 Railway Labor Act 863 SSID Title NVT 891 Agricultural Acts 196 Franchise 360 Other Personal Property Damage 751 Family and Medical 863 RSI (405(g)) 893 Environmental Ma 196 Pranchise 362 Personal Injury - Product Liability 790 Other Labor Liability 885 Property Damage 751 Family and Medical 0 362 Personal Injury - Product Liability 790 Other Labor Libility 895 Freedom of Inform Act 790 Other Labor Libility 386 Act 896 Arbitration 896 Arbitration	tions ters
REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS C 291 Employee Retirement FEDERAL TAX SUITS 3 899 Administrative Pro	
□ 210 Land Condemnation □ 440 Other Civil Rights Habeas Corpus: Income Security Act □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff Act/Review or App □ 220 Forcelosure □ 441 Voting □ 463 Alien Detance or Defendant) Agency Decision □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 442 Employment □ 510 Motions to Vacate □ 871 IRS—Third Parry □ 950 Constitutionality of □ 245 Tort Product Liability Accommodations □ 530 General □ 530 General □	
290 All Other Real Property 1 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 535 Death Penalty IMMIGRATION Employment Other: J 462 Naturalization Application	
□ 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - □ 540 Mandamus & Other □ 465 Other Immugration ○ ther □ 550 Civil Rights □ 465 Other Immugration □ 448 Education □ 555 Prison Condition □ 556 Prison Condition □ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Conditions of	
V. ORIGIN (Place on "X" in One Box Only)	
X 1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Rite' description of cause. FLSA OVERTIME VIOLATIONS, FLSA MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATION	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: Image: Complete co	:
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY INDER JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD	
RFCEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE	

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Former Santo Coyote Employees Sue Over Unpaid Wage Claims