1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 7 KELLY BOLDING, and MICHAEL 8 MANFREDI, individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, COMPLAINT – COLLECTIVE ACTION 9 AND CLASS ACTION Plaintiffs, 10 JURY TRIAL REQUESTED 11 v. BANNER BANK, a Washington Corporation, 12 Defendant. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

COLLECTIVE/CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES Page i

THE BLANKENSHIP LAW FIRM, P.S.

1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3250 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 343-2700

Kelly Bolding and Michael Manfredi, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated (Plaintiffs), by and through their counsel, for their complaint against Defendant Banner Bank, hereby state and allege as follows:

#### I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. Defendant Banner Bank is a Washington state chartered commercial bank and a subsidiary of Banner Corporation, a \$9.7 billion bank holding company. According to its website, Defendant Banner Bank operates 190 full-service branches and 12 loan offices in 58 counties in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, and Utah.
- 2. Kelly Bolding and Michael Manfredi bring this action individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated (Plaintiffs), for declaratory judgment, equitable relief, and money damages for Defendant's failure to pay non-exempt Residential Lenders (Loan Officers) overtime wages in accordance with the law, where commissions earned were not included in the calculation of the regular rate of pay for determination of proper overtime wages; and for Defendant's failure to properly record and pay wages to employees for all hours worked, instituted to secure the protection of and to redress the deprivation and interference with rights secured through:
  - a. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), 29 U.S.C. §201, et seq.;
  - b. Washington wage statutes, including RCW 49.46 et seq., RCW 49.48 et seq., and RCW 49.52 et seq.;
  - California Labor Code § 510 et seq., §204 et seq., §226 et seq., § 1174 et seq., and §1194 et seq., Cal. Code Regs., Title 8 §11040, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, and Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order No. 4;
  - d. Oregon Revised Statutes §652 *et seq.*, and §653 *et seq.*, and Oregon Administrative Rules, 839-020 *et seq.*;

- e. Utah Code Annotated, §34-28 et seq., U.C.A. §34-40 et seq., and Utah Administrative Code, Title R610 et seq.; and,
- f. Idaho Code §44-1501 et seq., I.C. §45-601 et seq.,
- 3. Plaintiffs are current and former Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other mortgage loan officer employees, employed by Defendant in facilities in states across the country that have been subject to the company's unlawful compensation practices. This includes employees of institutions acquired by Defendant Banner Bank within the statutory periods, such as AmericanWest Bank, which was acquired in 2015. This lawsuit is brought as a collective action under the FLSA and as a class action under state law to recover unpaid wages owed to individual Plaintiffs and all other similarly situated employees.

#### II. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND PARTIES

- 4. The FLSA authorizes court actions by private parties to recover damages for violation of the FLSA's wage and hour provisions. Jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' FLSA claims is based upon 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, and 1337.
- 5. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims for violations of the Washington wage statutes RCW 49.46 *et seq.*, RCW 49.48 *et seq.*, and RCW 49.52 *et seq.*, and the California Labor Code § 510 *et seq.*, §204 *et seq.*, §\$226 and 1174, Cal. Code Regs., Title 8 §11040, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, and §1194 *et seq.*; Oregon Revised Statutes §652 *et seq.*, and §653 *et seq.*, and Oregon Administrative Rules, 839-020 *et seq.*; Utah Code Annotated, §34-28 *et seq.*, U.C.A. §34-40 *et seq.*, and Utah Administrative Code, Title R610 *et seq.*; and, Idaho Code §44-1501 *et seq.*, I.C. §45-601 *et seq.*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367, in that the state claims are so related to the FLSA claims that they form part of the same case or controversy.
- 6. At all relevant times, Defendant was an employer in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §201 *et seq*.

7. Venue in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and (c), because Defendant does business in this district and a substantial part of the unlawful conduct giving rise to the claims occurred in this district.

#### III. THE PARTIES

- 8. Plaintiff and class representative Kelly Bolding is a resident of Washington. Ms. Bolding worked as a mortgage loan officer with the title of Residential Lender for Defendant, and for Defendant Banner Bank's predecessor in interest AmericanWest Bank.
- 9. Plaintiff and class representative Michael Manfredi is a resident of California.
  Mr. Manfredi worked as a mortgage loan officer with the title of Residential Lender for
  Defendant and Defendant Banner Bank's predecessor in interest AmericanWest Bank.
- 10. Defendant Banner Bank is a Washington state chartered commercial bank and a subsidiary of Banner Corporation, headquartered in Washington. Banner Bank operates full-service branches and loan offices throughout Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, and Utah.
- 11. The putative class includes all current and former Banner Bank loan officers, as well as loan officer employees of other banks merged with or acquired by Banner Bank during the relevant statutory period, such as AmericanWest Bank which was acquired in 2015.

#### IV. GENERAL COLLECTIVE AND CLASS FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 12. Plaintiffs are Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated employees who work for Defendant and perform the typical job duties of mortgage loan officers.
- 13. Plaintiffs receive internal leads and contact potential customers, or receive contacts from customers generated by direct mail or other marketing activities, about loans and mortgages.
- 14. They collect required financial information from customers they contact or who contact them, including information about income, employment history, judgments, and liens. They also run credit reports.

- 15. Plaintiffs use the collected financial information to identify which loan products may be offered to customers based on the financial information provided. They then assess the loan products identified and discuss with the customers the terms and conditions of particular loans, trying to match the customers' needs with one of Defendant's loan products.
- 16. Plaintiffs also compile customer documents for forwarding to an underwriter or loan processor, and may finalize documents for closings.
- 17. Defendant requires Plaintiffs to work "off-the-clock" for the benefit of Defendant without compensation, and fails to include earned commission wages in Plaintiffs' regular rate of pay for calculation of time-and-a-half overtime compensation.
- 18. Defendant Banner Bank has implemented a policy and practice of requiring employees, including Plaintiffs, to work "off-the-clock."
- 19. Employees are required to answer emails, phone calls, and otherwise communicate or meet with Defendant's customers in the mornings prior to arriving at work, in the evenings after leaving work, and on weekends.
- 20. Employees are also required to conduct meetings with customers or potential customers over lunch, dinner or otherwise out of the office.
- 21. Defendant's actions were willful. Defendant knew the job required more than 40 hours per week but then discouraged accurately recording overtime.
- 22. In addition, Defendant failed to properly pay overtime compensation to Plaintiffs.
- 23. Plaintiffs are compensated with a base salary and earn commissions on the loans purchased by customers.
- 24. Plaintiffs regularly work more than 40 hours per week, and when they do, Defendant pays them time-and-a-half compensation for overtime hours.
- 25. However, Defendant calculates time-and-a-half overtime compensation using only Plaintiffs' base salary to determine their regular rate of pay.

- 26. Defendant does not include commission payments in the calculation of Plaintiffs regular rate in violation of 29 C.F.R. §778.117 and 29 C.F.R. §778.118 and state wage statutes, including Washington and California.
- 27. The net effect of this policy and practice is that Defendant intentionally and willfully fails to keep accurate time records, and intentionally and willfully fails to properly calculate and pay overtime compensation.

# V. COLLECTIVE AND CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 29. Kelly Bolding and Michael Manfredi bring their FLSA claim as an "opt-in" collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b), on behalf of themselves and as representatives of the following persons:
  - a. All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and all other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers who performed work off-the-clock and were not compensated;
  - b. All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and all other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers who were paid overtime wages where the regular rate of pay used to calculate overtime wages did not include wages earned in the form of commissions.
- 30. Kelly Bolding and Michael Manfredi additionally bring state law wage and hour claims under FRCP 23 as a class action, for alleged violations of:
  - a. The Washington State wage statutes, RCW 49.46 *et seq.* (the Washington Minimum Wage Act (MWA)), RCW 49.48 *et seq.*, and RCW 49.52 *et seq.*, on behalf of themselves and as representatives of the following subclasses of persons:
    - (1) All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers in Washington State, from three years from the filing of this lawsuit to the present, who performed work off-the-clock and were not compensated;

- (2) All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers in Washington State, from three years from the filing of this lawsuit to the present, who were paid overtime wages where the regular rate of pay used to calculate overtime wages did not include wages earned in the form of commissions.
- b. The California Labor Code § 510 et seq., §204 et seq., §\$226, 1174, and 1194, Cal. Code Regs., Title 8 §11040, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, and IWC Wage Order No. 4; on behalf of themselves and as representatives of the following subclasses of persons:
  - (1) All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers in California, from four years from the filing of this lawsuit to the present, who performed work off-the-clock and were not compensated;
  - (2) All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers in California, from four years from the filing of this lawsuit to the present, who were paid overtime wages where the regular rate of pay used to calculate overtime wages did not include wages earned in the form of commissions.
- c. The Oregon Revised Statutes §652 *et seq.*, and §653 *et seq.*, and Oregon Administrative Rules, 839-020 *et seq.*, on behalf of themselves and as representatives of the following subclasses of persons:
  - (1) All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers in Oregon, from six years from the filing of this lawsuit to the present, who performed work off-the-clock and were not compensated.
- d. The Utah Code Annotated, §34-28 et seq., U.C.A. §34-40 et seq., and Utah Administrative Code, Title R610 et seq., on behalf of themselves and as representatives of the following subclasses of persons:

- (1) All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers in Utah, from two years from the filing of this lawsuit to the present, who performed work off-the-clock and were not compensated.
- e. The Idaho Code §44-1501 *et seq.*, I.C. §45-601 *et seq.*, on behalf of themselves and as representatives of the following subclasses of persons:
  - (1) All current and former Mortgage Loan Officers, Residential Lenders, and other similarly situated persons performing the typical duties of mortgage loan officers in Idaho, from two years from the filing of this lawsuit to the present, who performed work off-the-clock and were not compensated.
- 31. The FLSA claim may be pursued by those who opt-in to this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b). The state law claims, if certified for class-wide treatment, may be pursued by all similarly-situated persons who do not opt-out of the state-specific subclasses.
- 32. Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of other similarly situated employees, seek relief on a collective basis challenging, among other FLSA violations, Defendants' practice of failing to accurately record all hours worked and failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including failing to properly calculate and pay overtime compensation. The number and identity of other Plaintiffs yet to opt-in and consent to be party Plaintiffs may be determined from the records of Defendants, and potential class members may easily and quickly be notified of the pendency of this action.
- 33. Plaintiffs' state law claims satisfy the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy and superiority requirements for class action certification pursuant to FRCP 23.
- 34. The class satisfies the numerosity standards. The class is believed to number in the hundreds, or possibly over a thousand people. As a result, joinder of all class members in a single action is impracticable.

- 35. There are questions of law or fact common to the class, which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. The questions of law or fact common to the class arising from Defendant's actions include without limitation:
  - a. Whether Defendant failed to record and compensate employees for all hours worked;
  - b. Whether Defendant failed to properly calculate the regular rate of pay for determination of overtime wages;
  - c. Whether Defendant violated RCW 49.46 *et seq.*, 49.48 *et seq.*, and 49.52 *et seq.*, as to the Washington subclass;
  - d. Whether Defendant violated the California Labor Code § 510 et seq.,
    §204 et seq., §§226, 1174, and 1194, Cal. Code Regs., Title 8 §11040,
    Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, and IWC Wage Order No. 4, as to the
    California subclass;
  - e. Whether Defendant violated Oregon Revised Statutes §652 *et seq.*, and §653 *et seq.*, and Oregon Administrative Rules, 839-020 *et seq.*, as to the Oregon subclass;
  - f. Whether Defendant violated Utah Code Annotated, §34-28 *et seq.*, U.C.A. §34-40 *et seq.*, and Utah Administrative Code, Title R610 *et seq.*, as to the Utah subclass;
  - g. Whether Defendant violated Idaho Code §44-1501 *et seq.*, I.C. §45-601 *et seq.*, as to the Idaho subclass;
  - h. Whether Defendant acted willfully to deprive Plaintiffs and Class
     Members of earned and owed compensation and overtime;
  - Whether Plaintiffs and Class Members have sustained damages, and the proper measure of those damages.

2	0	
2	1	

- 36. The questions set forth above predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons, any differences in damages calculations can easily be managed by the court, and a class action is superior with respect to considerations of consistency, economy, efficiency, fairness and equity, to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the state law claims.
- 37. Ms. Bolding's and Mr. Manfredi's collective and class claims are typical of the class in that class members have been or are employed in the same or similar positions, and were subject to the same or similar unlawful practices.
- 38. A class action is the appropriate method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Defendant acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class. The presentation of separate actions by individual class members could create a risk of inconsistent and varying adjudications, establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant, and/or substantially impair or impede the ability of class members to protect their interests.
- 39. Ms. Bolding and Mr. Manfredi are adequate representatives of the class because they are members of the class and their interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the class they seek to represent. The interests of the members of the class will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiffs Bolding and Manfredi and their undersigned counsel, who have extensive experience prosecuting complex wage and hour, employment and class action litigation.
- 40. Maintenance of this action as a class action is a fair and efficient method for the adjudication of this controversy. It would be impracticable and undesirable for each member of the class who suffered harm to bring a separate action. In addition, the maintenance of separate actions would place a substantial and unnecessary burden on the courts and could result in inconsistent adjudications, while a single class action can determine, with judicial economy, the rights of all class members.

### COUNT I – VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

- 41. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs have been entitled to the rights, protections and benefits provided under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §201 *et seq*.
- 42. The FLSA regulates, among other things, the payment of overtime pay by employers whose employees are engaged in commerce, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).
- 43. Defendant was, and is, subject to the overtime pay requirements of the FLSA because it is an enterprise engaged in commerce and its employees are engaged in commerce.
- 44. Defendant violated the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §201 *et seq.*, by failing to compensate employees for all hours worked in compliance with 29 C.F.R. §785 (Hours Worked).
- 45. Defendant violated the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §201 *et seq.*, by failing to properly calculate overtime in compliance with 29 C.F.R. §778 (Overtime Compensation).
- 46. Defendant also violated the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §201 *et seq.*, when it willfully failed to keep accurate records of all hours worked by employees in compliance with 29 C.F.R. §516 (Records To Be Kept By Employers).
- 47. Plaintiffs are non-exempt workers and must be paid overtime in compliance with FLSA regulations, and U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, Administrator's interpretation No. 2010-1 (March 24, 2010).
- 48. Ms. Bolding, Mr. Manfredi, and all similarly situated current and former employees are subject to a uniform and company-wide compensation policy. This policy, in violation of the FLSA, has been and continues to be applied to all such employees.
- 49. Plaintiffs and all similarly situated employees are entitled to damages equal to the mandated overtime pay within the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint, plus periods of equitable tolling, because Defendant acted willfully and intentionally and knew or showed reckless disregard for the matter of whether their conduct was prohibited by the FLSA.

1	6	
1	7	

21

20

22

24

23

25

26

	50.	Defendant has not acted in good faith nor with reasonable grounds to believe its
actio	ns and on	nissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and as a result thereof, Plaintiffs and
othe	similarly	situated employees are entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an
amo	ınt equal	to the amount of unpaid wages and overtime pay described above, pursuant to
Secti	on 16(b)	of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Alternatively, Plaintiffs and all similarly
situa	ted emplo	oyees are entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

51. As a result of the aforesaid willful violations of the FLSA's overtime provisions, overtime compensation has been unlawfully withheld by Defendant from Plaintiffs for which Defendant is liable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), together with an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of this action.

# COUNT II – CLASS-WIDE VIOLATION OF WASHINGTON WAGE **STATUTES**

- 52. Defendant violated the Washington wage statutes, RCW 49.46 et seq., 49.48 et seq., and 49.52 et seq., in relevant part by failing to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs, including for off-the-clock work and overtime pay properly calculated using commission wages to determine the regular rate of pay.
- 53. Defendant knowingly and intentionally withheld, and continue to withhold, Plaintiffs' wages in violation of the aforementioned statutes.
  - 54. Plaintiffs were thereby damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

# COUNT III – CLASS-WIDE VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE AND CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

55. Defendant violated the California Labor Code § 510 et seq., §204 et seq., §§226, 1174, and 1194, Cal. Code Regs., Title 8 §11040, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, and IWC Wage Order No. 4, by failing to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs, including for off-the-

THE BLANKENSHIP LAW FIRM, P.S.

clock work and overtime pay properly calculated using commission wages to determine the regular rate of pay.

- 56. As alleged above, throughout the Class Period, Plaintiffs and Class Members were required to work more than eight hours per day. Plaintiffs and Class Members regularly worked more than 40 hours per week, including time worked off the clock, and often worked as much as 50 or more hours a week. Defendants, however, regularly did not pay Plaintiffs or Class Members overtime compensation for the hours they worked over eight hours in a day and 40 hours a week.
- 57. At all times herein relevant, California Labor Code § 510 and California Code of Regulations Title 8 § 11040 applied to Plaintiffs' work with Defendants and continue to apply to Class Members' employment with Defendants. California Labor Code § 510 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, § 11040 states that "employers must pay one and a half times an employee's 'regular rate' if he or she works more than 40 hours per week or more than eight hours per day." Cal. Labor Code § 510(a).
- 58. California Labor Code § 204 establishes the fundamental right of all employees in the State of California to be paid wages in a timely fashion for their work.
- 59. Pursuant to IWC Wage Order No. 4, Defendant is required to pay Plaintiffs and other members of the class for all hours worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of the employer.
- 60. Defendant's uniform policy and procedures requires its employees to work off the clock without compensation for time spent working for Defendant and/or subject to the control of the Defendant. Plaintiffs seek unpaid wages and penalties therefore.
- 61. California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that, at the time of each payment of wages, an employer shall provide each employee with a wage statement itemizing, among other things, the total hours worked by the employee in the pay period and the correct amount to be paid for each hour worked.

COLLECTIVE/CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

- 62. California Labor Code § 226(e) provides that an employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) is entitled to recover the greater of his or her actual damages or a penalty of \$50 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period (up to a maximum of \$4,000), in addition to attorneys' fees and costs.
- 63. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements to Plaintiffs and Class Members in accordance with Labor Code §226. The statements provided to Plaintiffs and Class Members have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, and the total hours worked by employees. Plaintiffs and the Class are therefore entitled to the damages and penalties provided for under Labor Code § 226(e).
- 64. Plaintiffs further bring this cause of action on behalf of the proposed Class, seeking statutory relief to stop the misconduct of Defendants, as complained herein, and to compel restitution and disgorgement of all profits obtained by Defendants through the unfair and unlawful business practices described herein.
- 65. The conduct of Defendants, as alleged herein, constitutes unlawful practices as set forth in California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. Specifically, Defendants conduct business activities while failing to comply with California wage and hour laws and the California common and statutory law as described herein—including the failure to pay overtime, and pay for all hours worked.
- 66. Section 17200 of the California Business & Professions Code prohibits unfair competition by prohibiting unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business practices or acts.
- 67. Defendants' failure to adopt policies in accordance with and/or adhere to these laws, all of which are binding upon and burdensome to Defendants' competitors, engenders an unfair competitive advantage for Defendants, thereby constituting an unfair business practice, as set forth in California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

25

26

- 68. Defendants' conduct as herein alleged has damaged Plaintiffs and members of the proposed Class by wrongfully denying them earned wages, overtime pay, and meal breaks and therefore was substantially injurious to Plaintiffs and the Class.
- 69. Under the circumstances alleged, it would be inequitable and result in a miscarriage of justice for Defendants to continue to retain the property of Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, entitling Plaintiffs and the proposed Class to restitution of the unfair benefits obtained and disgorgement of Defendants' ill-gotten gains.
- 70. As a result of Defendants' unlawful and unfair business practices, Plaintiffs and members of the proposed Class are entitled to and seek restitution and disgorgement, and other appropriate relief available under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq.
- 71. While the statute of limitations for Plaintiffs' overtime claims is three years, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code § 17208, the statute of limitations is effectively four years because Plaintiffs have brought claims under the California Unfair Competition Law.
- 72. Defendant knowingly and intentionally withheld, and continue to withhold, Plaintiff's wages in violation of the aforementioned statutes.
  - 73. Plaintiffs were thereby damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

#### COUNT IV – CLASS-WIDE VIOLATION OF OREGON WAGE STATUTES

- 74. Defendant violated the Oregon Revised Statutes §652 *et seq.*, and §653 *et seq.*, and Oregon Administrative Rules, 839-020 *et seq.*, in relevant part by failing to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs, including for off-the-clock.
- 75. Defendant knowingly and intentionally withheld, and continue to withhold, Plaintiffs' wages in violation of the aforementioned statutes.
  - 76. Plaintiffs were thereby damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

#### COUNT V – CLASS-WIDE VIOLATION OF UTAH WAGE STATUTES

77.	Defendant violated the Utah Code Annotated, §34-28 et seq., U.C.A. §34-40 et
seq., and Utah	Administrative Code, Title R610 et seq., in relevant part by failing to pay all
wages due to l	Plaintiffs, including for off-the-clock.

- 78. Defendant knowingly and intentionally withheld, and continue to withhold, Plaintiffs' wages in violation of the aforementioned statutes.
  - 79. Plaintiffs were thereby damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

# COUNT VI - CLASS-WIDE VIOLATION OF IDAHO WAGE STATUTES

- 80. Defendant violated the Idaho Code §44-1501 *et seq.*, I.C. §45-601 *et seq.*, in relevant part by failing to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs, including for off-the-clock.
- 81. Defendant knowingly and intentionally withheld, and continue to withhold, Plaintiffs' wages in violation of the aforementioned statutes.
  - 82. Plaintiffs were thereby damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

#### VI. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

- 83. Plaintiffs and Class Members reserve the right to amend these claims for relief, including for claims of retaliation for assertion of these rights under applicable state and federal laws.
- 84. Under FRCP 2 and 8, Plaintiffs and the Class Members are not required to plead every legal theory supporting claims for relief, and through the discovery process expect to uncover additional evidence of unlawful employment practices. Thus, this short and plain statement of claims under Rule 8 is not exhaustive of the fact and legal theories that will be presented at trial.

#### VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court:

COLLECTIVE/CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, its officers, successors, agents, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in

25

any other employment practice which deprives employees of their wages or violates the law or public policy;

- B. Order Defendant to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which eradicate the effects of their past and present unlawful employment practices;
- C. Order Defendant to make Plaintiffs and Class Members whole for the wrongful withholding of wages by providing relief, including awarding exemplary, double, or treble damages, under:
  - a. The Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §201, et seq.;
  - b. RCW 49.46 et seq., 49.48 et seq., and RCW 49.52 et seq.;
  - c. California Labor Code § 510 et seq., §204 et seq., §§226, 1174, and 1194, Cal. Code Regs., Title 8 §11040, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, and IWC Wage Order No. 4;
  - d. Oregon Revised Statutes §652 *et seq.*, and §653 *et seq.*, and Oregon Administrative Rules, 839-020 *et seq.*,
  - e. Utah Code Annotated, §34-28 et seq., U.C.A. §34-40 et seq., and Utah Administrative Code, Title R610 et seq.;
  - f. Idaho Code §44-1501 et seq., I.C. §45-601 et seq.; or,
  - g. Any other applicable statute.
- D. Order Defendant to make Plaintiffs and Class Members whole by taking all other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of their unlawful employment practices;
- E. Order Defendant to pay punitive, double, exemplary, and/or liquidated damages to the fullest extent allowed by law;
- F. Award Plaintiffs and Class Members the costs of this action, including attorneys' fees, expert fees, and all other costs to the fullest extent allowed by law;

Scott C. G. Blankenship, WSBA No. 21431 Robin J. Shishido, WSBA No. 45926 Jordan A. Taren, WSBA No. 50066 The Blankenship Law Firm, P.S. 1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3250 Telephone: (206) 343-2700 Facsimile: (206) 343-2704 sblankenship@blankenshiplawfirm.com rshishido@blankenshiplawfirm.com jtaren@blankenshiplawfirm.com

**Print** 

Save As...

# Case 2:17-cv-00601 Page 1 of 2 Page 2:17-cv-00601 Page 1 of 2

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.)

purpose of initiating the civil do			THIS FORM.)	19/4, is required for the use of	the Clerk of Court for the
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS KELLY BOLDING, and M of all other similarly situa		individually and on b	ehalf DEFENDANTS BANNER BANK, a	a Washington Corporation	n
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Spokane (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			NOTE: IN LAND CO	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O DNDEMNATION CASES, USE TI OF LAND INVOLVED.	· ·
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A The Blankenship Law Fir 1000 Second Ave., Suite Seattle, WA 98104	m, P.S.	r)	Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	II. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti,
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		TF DEF  1 □ 1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In T	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2	•
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On	aly)			
CONTRACT  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 (Excludes 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  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	FORFEITURE/PENALTY    625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881   690 Other    LABOR	BANKRUPTCY    422 Appeal 28 USC 158   423 Withdrawal	OTHER STATUTES  375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 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 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	Cite the U.S. Civil State 29 U.S.C. § 201 e Brief description of car Failure to pay not UNDER RULE 2	Appellate Court  attet under which you are set seq. (FLSA)  ause: n-exempt Residential  IS A CLASS ACTION  3, F.R.Cv.P.	4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transfe Anothe (specify Filing (Do not cite jurisdictional state)  Lenders overtime wages  DEMAND \$	and failure to pay and re  CHECK YES only  JURY DEMAND:	- Litigation - Direct File  cord all hours worked. if demanded in complaint:
DATE DATE		JUDGE SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEY OF RECORD	DOCKET NUMBER	
04/14/2017		s/ Scott C. G. Bla			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	IUDGE	MAG IIII	DGE

Reset

#### 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 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 – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- 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.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Washington

KELLY BOLDING, and MICHAEL MANFREDI, individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated,	) ) )		
Plaintiff(s)	)		
v.	Civil Action No.		
BANNER BANK, a Washington Corporation	) ) )		
Defendant(s)	, )		
SUMMONS II	N A CIVIL ACTION		
To: (Defendant's name and address)  BANNER BANK c/o Kendra Keller, Branch 1222 E. Madison St., Ste Seattle, WA 98122			
A lawsuit has been filed against you.			
are the United States or a United States agency, or an off P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an a	you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you icer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. nswer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of tion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,		
Scott C. G. Blankenship,	WSBA No. 21431		
Jordan A. Taren, WSBA	No. 50066		
The Blankenship Law Fir			
1000 Second Ave., Suite 3250 Seattle, WA 98104			
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		
Doto			
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk		

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

# PROOF OF SERVICE

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

was ra	This summons for (no ceived by me on (date)	ame of individual and title, if a	ny)	
was re	cerved by the on (aate)		·	
	☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the inc	lividual at (place)	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I left the summon	s at the individual's reside	ence or usual place of abode with (name)	
			, a person of suitable age and discretion who res	sides there,
	on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or I served the summons on (name of individual)			
	designated by law to	accept service of process	s on behalf of (name of organization)	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted becaus	e	; or
	☐ Other ( <i>specify</i> ):			
	My fees are \$	for travel and S	\$ for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	I declare under penal	Ity of perjury that this info	ormation 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: <u>Loan Officers Claim Banner Bank Miscalculates Overtime Wages</u>