UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

CHRISTOPHER BLOCK, an individual, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Case No. 19-cv-430

Plaintiff,

v.

WISCONSIN HOSPITALITY GROUP, LLC, d/b/a APPLEBEE'S GRILL & BAR, a Wisconsin Limited Liability Company, and DOES 1 through 5,

Defendants.

NATIONWIDE CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, Plaintiff Christopher Block, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and asserts as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated against Wisconsin Hospitality Group, LLC, d/b/a Applebee's Grill & Bar, and Does 1 through 5 (collectively "Defendants"), asserting violations of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* (the "ADA"), and its implementing regulations, in connection with accessibility barriers in the parking lots and paths of travel at various public accommodations owned, operated, controlled, and/or leased by Defendants ("Defendants' facilities").
- 2. Plaintiff has a mobility disability and is limited in the major life activity of walking, which has caused him to use a wheelchair for mobility.
- 3. Plaintiff has visited Defendants' facilities and was denied full and equal access as a result of Defendants' inaccessible parking lots and paths of travel.

- 4. Plaintiff's experiences are not isolated—Defendants have systematically discriminated against individuals with mobility disabilities by implementing policies and practices that consistently violate the ADA's accessibility guidelines and routinely result in access barriers at Defendants' facilities.
- 5. In fact, numerous facilities owned, controlled, and/or operated by Defendants have parking lots and paths of travel that are inaccessible to individuals who rely on wheelchairs for mobility, demonstrating that the centralized decision-making Defendants employ with regard to the design, construction, alteration, maintenance, and operation of its facilities causes access barriers and/or allows them to develop and persist at Defendants' facilities.
- 6. Unless Defendants are required to remove the access barriers described below and required to change their policies and practices so that access barriers do not reoccur at Defendants' facilities, Plaintiff and the proposed Class will continue to be denied full and equal access to those facilities as described and will be deterred from fully using Defendants' facilities.
- 7. The ADA expressly contemplates injunctive relief aimed at modification of a policy or practice that Plaintiff seeks in this action. In relevant part, the ADA states:

[i]n the case of violations of . . . this title, injunctive relief shall include an order to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities Where appropriate, injunctive relief shall also include requiring the . . . modification of a policy

42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2).

- 8. Consistent with 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2), Plaintiff seeks a permanent injunction requiring that:
 - a. Defendants remediate all parking and path of travel access barriers at Defendants' facilities, consistent with the ADA;
 - b. Defendants change their policies and practices so that the parking and path of travel access barriers at Defendants' facilities do not reoccur; and

- c. Plaintiff's representatives shall monitor Defendants' facilities to ensure that the injunctive relief ordered pursuant to Paragraph 8.a. and 8.b. has been implemented and will remain in place.
- 9. Plaintiff's claims for permanent injunctive relief are asserted as class claims pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2). Rule 23(b)(2) was specifically intended to be utilized in civil rights cases where the plaintiffs seek injunctive relief for his or her own benefit and the benefit of a class of similarly situated individuals. To that end, the note to the 1996 amendment to Rule 23 states:

Subdivision(b)(2). This subdivision is intended to reach situations where a party has taken action or refused to take action with respect to a class, and final relief of an injunctive nature or a corresponding declaratory nature, settling the legality of the behavior with respect to the class as a whole, is appropriate Illustrative are various actions in the civil rights field where a party is charged with discriminating unlawfully against a class, usually one whose members are incapable of specific enumeration.

THE ADA AND ITS IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS

- 10. The ADA was enacted nearly 30 years ago and is intended to "provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities." 42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1).
- 11. The ADA broadly protects the rights of individuals with disabilities in employment, access to State and local government services, places of public accommodation, transportation, and other important areas of American life.
- 12. Title III of the ADA generally prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities in the full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations (42 U.S.C. § 12182(a)), and prohibits places of public accommodation, either directly or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, from outright denying individuals with disabilities the opportunity to participate in a place of public accommodation (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(i)), or denying

individuals with disabilities the opportunity to fully and equally participate in a place of public accommodation (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii)).

- 13. Title III further prohibits places of public accommodation from utilizing methods of administration that have the effect of discriminating on the basis of a disability. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(D).
- 14. Title III and its implementing regulations define discrimination to include the following:
 - a) Failure to remove architectural barriers when such removal is readily achievable for places of public accommodation that existed prior to January 26, 1992, 28 C.F.R.§ 36.304(a) and 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv);
 - b) Failure to design and construct places of public accommodation for first occupancy after January 26, 1993, that are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, 28 C.F.R. § 36.401 and 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1);
 - c) For alterations to public accommodations made after January 26, 1992, failure to make alterations so that the altered portions of the public accommodation are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, 28 C.F.R. § 36.402 and 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2); and
 - d) Failure to maintain those features of public accommodations that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities, 28 C.F.R. § 36.211.
- 15. The remedies and procedures set forth at 42 U.S.C. § 2000a-3(a) are provided to any person who is being subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability or who has reasonable grounds for believing that such person is about to be subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183. 42 U.S.C. 12188(a)(1).
- 16. The ADA also provides for specific injunctive relief, which includes the following:

In the case of violations of sections 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and section 12183(a) of this title, injunctive relief shall include an order to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the

extent required by this subchapter. Where appropriate, injunctive relief shall also include . . . modification of a policy . . . to the extent required by this subchapter.

42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2); 28 C.F.R. § 36.501(b).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 17. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.
- 18. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district, and Defendants do substantial business, and have their principal place of business, in this judicial district.
- 19. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2) in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events and/or omissions at issue occurred.

PARTIES

20. Plaintiff Christopher Block is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a resident of Lake Forest, Illinois. As described above, as a result of his disability, Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility. Plaintiff suffered an injury two years ago which resulted in a fracture to his fifth vertebrae, leaving him paralyzed from the chest down. Despite these significant injuries, Mr. Block is an active equestrian and rower. Prior to his injury, Mr. Block earned a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering from Virginia Tech University and a master's degree in biological end systems engineering also from Virginia Tech. Plaintiff worked for various companies as a test engineer until the time of his injury. Since that time, he has persevered through multiple surgeries to regain his strength and use of his arms. Plaintiff looks forward to returning to the workforce in the coming months. Plaintiff is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2), and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 C.F.R. §§ 36.101 et seq.

- 21. Defendant Wisconsin Hospitality Group is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a Wisconsin limited liability company, with its principal place of business in Waukesha, Wisconsin. Defendant owns and operates restaurants. Defendant is the largest restaurant franchisee in Wisconsin. Defendant owns and operates two primary restaurant brands:

 Applebee's and Pizza Hut. As is relevant to this lawsuit Wisconsin Hospitality Group owns 33

 Applebee's Grill & Bars throughout the state of Wisconsin. See, "Our Story," at http://www.whgonline.com/ (last accessed March 21, 2019). The Applebee's locations Wisconsin Hospitality Group owns and operates include those locations which Plaintiff encountered, as described in more detail below. See list of owned locations at, http://www.whgonline.com/APP-Brands (last accessed March 21, 2019).
- 22. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise of the Defendants named herein as Does 1 through 5, are unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously-named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged in this Complaint.
- 23. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, including Doe Defendants, and each of them at all times mentioned in this Complaint were the alter egos, agents and/or employees and/or employers of their Co-Defendants and in doing the things alleged in this Complaint were acting within the course of such agency and/or employment and with the permission and consent of their Co-Defendants.
 - 24. Defendants are a public accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12181(7).

FACTUAL ASSERTIONS

I. Plaintiff Has Been Denied Full and Equal Access to Defendants' Facilities

- 25. Plaintiff has visited Defendants' facilities located at 6950 75th Street in Kenosha, Wisconsin, where he experienced unnecessary difficulty and risk due to excessive slopes in a purportedly accessible parking area. The Applebee's location Plaintiff visited is owned/operated by Wisconsin Hospitality Group.
- 26. Despite this difficulty and risk, Plaintiff plans to return to Defendants' facilities. Plaintiff's favorite things to eat at Applebee's are the chicken salads (southwestern and Thai), as well as appetizers. Plaintiff travels to Wisconsin about once a month, most often to either do Diveheart scuba diving at Marquette University in Milwaukee or to go visit his friend who lives in Milwaukee. Plaintiff likes to stop at the Applebee's in Kenosha, because it on the way to the scuba diving and to his friend's house. He would like to return to this location in the future but is deterred from doing so given the limitations of the facility. Furthermore, Plaintiff intends to return to Defendants' facilities to ascertain whether those facilities remain in violation of the ADA.
- 27. As a result of Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA, Plaintiff's ability to access and safely use Defendants' facilities has been significantly impeded.
- 28. Plaintiff will be deterred from returning to and fully and safely accessing Defendants' facilities, so long as Defendants' facilities remain non-compliant, and so long as Defendants continue to employ the same policies and practices that have led, and in the future will lead, to inaccessibility at Defendants' facilities.
- 29. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff will continue to be unable to fully and safely access Defendants' facilities in violation of his rights under the ADA.
- 30. As an individual with mobility disabilities who uses a wheelchair, Plaintiff is directly interested in whether public accommodations, like Defendants' facilities, have

architectural barriers that impede full accessibility to those accommodations by individuals with mobility-related disabilities.

- II. Defendants Repeatedly Deny Individuals With Disabilities Full and Equal Access to Defendants' Facilities.
- 31. As the owner and manager of their properties, Defendants employ centralized policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the design, construction, alteration, maintenance, and operation of their facilities.
- 32. To date, Defendants' centralized design, construction, alteration, maintenance, and operational policies and practices have systematically and routinely violated the ADA by designing, constructing, and altering facilities so that they are not readily accessible and usable, by failing to remove architectural barriers, and by failing to maintain and operate facilities so that the accessible features of Defendants' facilities are maintained.
- 33. On Plaintiff's behalf, investigators examined multiple locations owned, controlled, and/or operated by Defendants and found the following violations, which are illustrative of the fact that Defendants implement policies and practices that routinely result in accessibility violations:
 - a. 6950 75th Street, Kenosha, WI
 - i. The surfaces of one or more purportedly accessible parking spaces had slopes exceeding 6.9%;
 - ii. The surfaces of one or more purportedly accessible aisles had slopes exceeding 10.4%.
 - b. 2521 South Green Bay Road, Racine, WI
 - i. The purportedly accessible entrance to the facility has a slope exceeding 8.0%.
 - c. 7135 South 13th St., Oak Creek, WI

- i. The surfaces of one or more purportedly accessible parking spaces had slopes exceeding 2.1%;
- ii. The surfaces of one or more purportedly accessible aisles had slopes exceeding 2.1%.
- iii. The surfaces of the purportedly accessible curb ramp had slopes exceeding 2.1%.

d. 15505 Rock Ridge Rd., New Berlin, WI

i. The surfaces of one or more purportedly accessible curb ramps had slopes exceeding 2.1%;

e. 3100 Golf Road, Delafield, WI

- i. The surfaces of one or more purportedly accessible parking spaces had cross-slopes exceeding 6.0%;
- 34. The fact that individuals with mobility-related disabilities are denied full and equal access to numerous of Defendants' facilities, and the fact that each of these facilities deny access by way of inaccessible parking facilities, is evidence that the inaccessibility Plaintiff experienced is not isolated, but rather, is caused by Defendants' systemic disregard for the rights of individuals with disabilities.
- 35. Defendants' systemic access violations demonstrate that Defendants either employ policies and practices that fail to design, construct, and alter their facilities so that they are readily accessible and usable and/or that Defendants employ maintenance and operational policies and practices that are unable to maintain accessibility.
- 36. As evidenced by the widespread inaccessibility of Defendants' parking facilities, absent a change in Defendants' corporate policies and practices, access barriers are likely to reoccur in Defendants' facilities even after they have been remediated.

37. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks an injunction to remove the barriers currently present at Defendants' facilities and an injunction to modify the policies and practices that have created or allowed, and will create or allow, inaccessibility to affect Defendants' network of facilities.

CLASS ASSERTIONS

38. Plaintiff brings this class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(2) on behalf of himself and the following nationwide class:

All persons with qualified mobility disabilities who were denied the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations of any Applebee's location in the United States that is owned, operated, or controlled by Wisconsin Hospitality Group, LLC, on the basis of disability because such persons encountered accessibility barriers due to Defendants' failure to comply with the ADA's accessible parking and path of travel requirements.

- 39. <u>Numerosity</u>: The class described above is so numerous that joinder of all individual members in one action would be impracticable. The disposition of the individual claims of the respective class members through this class action will benefit both the parties and this Court and will facilitate judicial economy.
- 40. <u>Typicality</u>: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the class. The claims of Plaintiff and members of the class are based on the same legal theories and arise from the same unlawful conduct.
- 41. <u>Common Questions of Fact and Law</u>: There is a well-defined community of interest and common questions of fact and law affecting members of the class in that they all have been and/or are being denied their civil rights to full and equal access to, and use and enjoyment of, Defendants' facilities and/or services due to Defendants' failure to make their facilities fully accessible and independently usable as above described.
- 42. <u>Adequacy of Representation</u>: Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the class. Plaintiff will

fairly, adequately, and vigorously represent and protect the interests of the members of the class and has no interests antagonistic to the members of the class. Plaintiff has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in the prosecution of class action litigation, generally, and who possess specific expertise in the context of class litigation under the ADA.

43. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, making appropriate both declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiff and the class as a whole.

SUBSTANTIVE VIOLATION

- 44. The assertions contained in the previous paragraphs are incorporated by reference.
- 45. Defendants' facilities were altered, designed, or constructed after the effective date of the ADA.
- 46. Defendants' facilities are required to be altered, designed, and constructed so that they are readily accessible to and usable by individuals who use wheelchairs. 42 U.S.C.§ 12183(a).
- 47. Further, the accessible features of Defendants' facilities, which include the parking lots and paths of travel, are required to be maintained so that they are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with mobility disabilities. 28 C.F.R.§ 36.211.
- 48. The architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendants' facilities were not altered, designed, or constructed in a manner that causes them to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals who use wheelchairs and/or that Defendants' facilities were not maintained so as to ensure that they remained accessible to and usable by individuals who use wheelchairs.

- 49. Furthermore, the architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendantshave failed to remove barriers as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).
- 50. Defendants' repeated and systemic failures to design, construct, and alter their facilities so that they are readily accessible and usable, to remove architectural barriers, and to maintain the accessible features of their facilities constitute unlawful discrimination on the basis of a disability in violation of Title III of the ADA.
- 51. Defendants' facilities are required to comply with the Department of Justice's 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, or in some cases the 1991 Standards. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 36.406; 28 C.F.R., pt. 36, app. A.
- 52. Defendants are required to provide individuals who use wheelchairs full and equal enjoyment of their facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).
- 53. Defendants have failed, and continue to fail, to provide individuals who use wheelchairs with full and equal enjoyment of their facilities.
- 54. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff and the class in that they have failed to make Defendants' facilities fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who use wheelchairs in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) as described above.
- 55. Defendants' conduct is ongoing and continuous, and Plaintiff hasbeen harmed by Defendants' conduct.
- 56. Unless Defendants are restrained from continuing their ongoing and continuous course of conduct, Defendants will continue to violate the ADA and will continue to inflict injury upon Plaintiff and the class.
- 57. Given that Defendants have not complied with the ADA's requirements to make Defendants' facilities fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who use

wheelchairs, Plaintiff invokes his statutory right to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the members of the Class, pray for:

- a. A declaratory judgment that Defendants are in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the ADA, in that Defendants' facilities, as described above, are not fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who use wheelchairs;
- b. A permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 C.F.R. § 36.501(b) that: (i) directs Defendants to take all steps necessary to remove the architectural barriers described above and to bring their facilities into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA, and its implementing regulations, so that the facilities are fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who use wheelchairs; (ii) directs Defendants to change their policies and practices to prevent the reoccurrence of access barriers post-remediation; and (iii) directs that Plaintiff shall monitor Defendants' facilities to ensure that the injunctive relief ordered above remains in place.
- c. An Order certifying the class proposed by Plaintiff, naming Plaintiff as class representative, and appointing his counsel as class counsel;
- d. Payment of costs of suit;
- e. Payment of reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 C.F.R. § 36.505; and

f. The provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable, and appropriate.

Dated: March 26, 2019 Respectfully Submitted,

ADEMI & O'REILLY, LLP

By: s/ John D. Blythin

Guri Ademi
John D. Blythin
Mark A. Eldridge
3620 East Layton Avenue
Cudahy, WI 53110
(414) 482-8000
(414) 482-8001 (fax)
gademi@ademilaw.com
jblythin@ademilaw.com
meldridge@ademilaw.com

Benjamin J. Sweet (to be admitted pro hac vice)

THE SWEET LAW FIRM, PC

186 Mohawk Drive Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228

Phone: 412-742-0631 ben@sweetlawpc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff CHRISTOPHER BLOCK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

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

Place an X in the appropriate Box: Green Bay Division				☑ Milwaukee Division			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS				
Christopher Block				Wisconsin Hospitality Group, LLC			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name Ademi & O'Reilly, LLP,	e of First Listed Plaintiff EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA e, Address, and Telephone Numbe 3620 E. Layton Ave., Cudahy, WI ne (414) 482-8001-Facsimile	er)	NOTE: IN LANI	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)			
		n One Roy Only)	CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "Y" in One Roy for Plaintiff		
☐ 1 U.S. Government ☑ 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only) P	PTF DEF PTF DEF			
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	_	2 Incorporated and I of Business In 2 3 3 Foreign Nation			
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T		Foreign Country	<u> </u>			
CONTRACT	TOF	*	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ■ & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	_	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee 465 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 R	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 42 U.S.C. § 12101	Appellate Court			Judgment		
	Violation of Title III of th	tuse: ne Americans with Disabilities					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	r if demanded in complaint: : ☑ Yes ☐ No		
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR					
March 26, 2019 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		s/ John D. Bl	ythin				

- AMOUNT JUDGE - Case 2:19-cy-00430 Filed 03/26/19 Page 1 of 2 Document 1-1

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.C.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; 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 clerks 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 seven 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.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

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 dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) 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.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the Eastern District of Wisconsin

Edition District of Wisconsin						
CHRISTOPHE Plaintiff V. WISCONSIN HOSPITA Defendar	(s) LITY GROUP, LLC))))) Civil Action No. 19-ev-))))				
	SUMMONS 1	IN A CIVIL ACTION				
WISCONSIN HOSPITALITY GROUP, LLC 2120 PEWAUKEE RD STE 200 WAUKESHA, WI 53188-2491						
A lawsuit has been file	ed against you.					
the United States or a United 12(a)(2) or (3) – you must se	States agency, or an officerve on the plaintiff an ans	n you (not counting the day you receive it) – or 60 days if you are there or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. swer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the name of the plaintiff or the plaintiff's attorney, whose				
If you fail to respond, You also must file your answe	• •	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.				
		STEPHEN C. DRIES, CLERK OF COURT				
Date:		Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk				

Civil Action No. 19-cv-

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

were r	eceived by me on (date)	·				
	☐ I personally served	the summons and the attached complain	nt on the individual at (place):			
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I left the summons	and the attached complaint at the indivi	idual's residence or usual place of a	abode with (name)		
		, a perso	n of suitable age and discretion wh	o resides there,		
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to the	ne individual's last known address;	or		
	☐ I served the summo	ons and the attached complaint on (name	of individual)			
	who is designated by la	aw to accept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)			
		on	(date)	; or		
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		; or		
	Other (specify):					
	My food one \$	for travel and \$	for complete for a total of C	0.00		
			for services, for a total of \$	0.00		
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information is true.				
Date:						
2			Server's signature			
			Printed name and title			
			Server's address			

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc.:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Wisconsin Applebee's Franchisee Facing ADA Suit Over Alleged Parking Lot Slopes